



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

# Officers of the Cincinnati Meeting

---

## PRESIDENT

G. M. PETERS, A.M.

## VICE-PRESIDENTS

J. R. SPENCER, M.D.

REV. G. P. OSBORNE.

## SECRETARY

THEO. A. K. GESSLER, D.D., LANDING, N. J.

## TREASURER

W. B. MATTESON, D.D., RED BANK, N. J.

## CINCINNATI LOCAL COMMITTEE

G. W. LASHER, D.D., CHAIRMAN.

HORACE C. DRAKE, SECRETARY.

GEORGE E. STEVENS,  
REV. C. S. BROWN,  
FRANK F. COLLINS,

REV. J. F. HERGET,  
REV. G. P. OSBORNE,  
W. R. BIDDLE.

## STENOGRAPHERS

MR. MATT. DAY,  
MISS MABEL NELSON.

---

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE CONGRESS

HENRY M. SANDERS, D.D., Chairman, New York.

W. B. MATTESON, D.D., Treasurer, Red Bank, N. J.

THEO. A. K. GESSLER, D.D., Secretary, Landing, N. J.

REV. JAMES M. BRUCE,

C. D. CASE, PH.D.,

NORMAN FOX, D.D.,

REV. FRANK M. GOODCHILD,

WILLIAM A. GRANGER, D.D.,

RUFUS P. JOHNSTON, D.D.,

ALBERT G. LAWSON, D.D.,

WILLIAM M. LAWRENCE, D.D.,

ROBERT MACDONALD, D.D.,

EVERETT T. TOMLINSON, PH.D.,

KERR BOYCE TUPPER, D.D., LL.D.,

REV. A. S. WISHART.

## THE GENERAL COMMITTEE

---

Anderson, T. D., D.D.....	Albany, N. Y.
Andrews, Pres. E. Benj., LL.D.....	Lincoln, Neb.
Baldwin, Mr. Jesse A.....	Chicago, Ill.
Barbour, T. S., D.D.....	Boston, Mass.
Barbour, C. A., D.D.....	Rochester, N. Y.
Barnes, H. W., D.D.....	Binghamton, N. Y.
Barnes, L. C., D.D.....	Worcester, Mass.
Batten, Rev. S. Z.....	Lincoln, Neb.
Betteridge, Prof. W. R., Ph.D.....	18 Sibley Place, Rochester, N. Y.
Biglow, Mr. L. H.....	New York City.
Bitting, W. C., D.D.....	New York City.
Blackford, Mr. Eugene.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Braislin, Ed., D.D.....	Colorado Springs, Col.
Broughton, Len G., D.D.....	Atlanta, Ga.
Brown, Mr. Samuel N.....	Boston, Mass.
Bruce, Rev. James M.....	Oakland, N. J.
Burton, Prof. Ernest D., D.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Burnham, Prof. S., D.D.....	Hamilton, N. Y.
Burr, E. D., D.D.....	Newton Centre, Mass.
Calley, Walter, D.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Case, Rev. C. D., Ph.D.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Cheney, Rev. D. B.....	Terre Haute, Ind.
Clarke, Prof. W. N., D.D.....	Hamilton, N. Y.
Clinch, Mr. Edward S.....	New York City.
Coats, A. S., D.D.....	Buffalo, N. Y.
Colby, H. F., D.D.....	Dayton, O.
Colgate, Mr. Jas. C.....	New York City.
Colgate, Mr. Richard M.....	West Orange, N. J.
Colwell, R. S., D.D.....	Granville, O.
Conwell, Russell H., D.D.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
Crandall, L. A., D.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Cronkhite, Mr. L. W.....	Sandy Hill, N. Y.
De Blois, A. K., Ph.D., LL.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Dingee, Mr. Charles.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Dodd, Rev. Chas. H., D.D.....	Baltimore, Md.

Eaches, O. P., D.D..... Hightstown, N. J.  
 Earle, Rev. C. C..... Lawrence, Mass.  
 Evans, Prof. M. G., D.D..... Chester, Pa.

Farnham, E. P., D.D..... Brooklyn, N. Y.  
 Faunce, Pres. W. H. P., D.D., LL.D..... Providence, R. I.  
 Ferris, Rev. Geo. H..... New Haven, Conn.  
 Fox, Norman, D.D..... New York City.

Garrabrandt, Mr. D. G..... Bloomfield, N. J.  
 Gates, Mr. I. E..... New York City.  
 Gessler, T. A. K., D.D..... Landing P. O., N. J.  
 Gifford, O. P., D.D..... Buffalo, N. Y.  
 Goodchild, Rev. F. M..... New York City.  
 Goodman, Mr. Edward..... Chicago, Ill.  
 Granger, W. A., D.D..... Mt. Vernon, N. Y.  
 Grippin, Mr. Wm. A..... Bridgeport, Conn.

Hahn, B. D., D.D..... Springfield, Mass.  
 Harper, Pres. W. R., Ph.D., LL.D..... Chicago, Ill.  
 Hegeman, Mr. John R..... New York City.  
 Hills, Mr. Wm..... New York City.  
 Holt, Prof. L. Emmett, M.D..... New York City.  
 Horr, Prof. Geo. E., D.D..... Newton Centre, Mass.  
 Howard, Hon. J. L..... Hartford, Conn.  
 Hughes, Mr. Chas. E..... New York City.  
 Hulbert, Prof. E. B., D.D..... Chicago, Ill.  
 Hunt, Pres. Emory W., LL.D..... Granville, O.

Isaacs, Mr. W. M..... New York City.

Jackson, Rev. J. L..... Chicago, Ill.  
 Johnson, Prof. E. H., D.D..... Chester, Pa.  
 Johnston, R. P., D.D..... New York City.  
 Jones, Carter Helm, D.D..... Louisville, Ky.  
 Jones, Howard L., D.D..... Chattanooga, Tenn.  
 Jones, Rev. M. Ashby, D.D..... Richmond, Va.  
 Judson, Prof. H. P., LL.D..... Chicago, Ill.

Kenyon, Mr. Jas. S..... Providence, R. I.  
 Keen, Prof. W. W., M.D., LL.D..... Philadelphia, Pa.

Lamport, Mr. H. H..... Brooklyn, N. Y.  
 Laws, Rev. Curtis Lee..... Baltimore, Md.  
 Lawson, Albert G., D.D..... Newark, N. J.  
 Lincoln, Mr. Wm. E..... Pittsburg, Pa.  
 Lindsley, Mr. W. L..... Pittsburg, Pa.

Marston, Mr. Edgar L.....	New York City.
Marvin, J. B., M.D., LL.D.....	Louisville, Ky.
Matteson, Rev. W. B.....	Red Bank, N. J.
McDonald, Robert, D.D.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
McDonald, Mr. Wm.....	Albany, N. Y.
McKibben, W. K.....	Pasadena, Cal.
Meeser, S. B., D.D.....	Detroit, Mich.
Milbank, Mr. Jos.....	New York City.
Mullins, Pres. E. Y., D.D.....	Louisville, Ky.
Moore, Addison, D.D.....	Jersey City, N. J.
Murray, Mr. Geo. W.....	Montclair, N. J.
Nelson, S. Gifford, D.D.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Osborne, L. D.....	Des Moines, Iowa.
Paddock, C. A., D.D.....	Hartford, Conn.
Parker, Prof. A. K., D.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Peabody, H. H., D.D.....	Rome, N. Y.
Pease, Mr. John D.....	New York City.
Peters, G. M.....	Cincinnati, O.
Porter, Hon. H. K.....	Pittsburg, Pa.
Randall, J. H., D.D.....	Grand Rapids, Mich.
Rauschenbusch, Prof. Walter.....	Rochester, N. Y.
Rhees, Pres. Rush, LL.D.....	Rochester, N. Y.
Rhoades, W. C. P., D.D.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Rosselle, Rev. W. Quay.....	Williamsport, Pa.
Rowland, A. J., D.D.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
Sampey, Prof. John R., D.D.....	Louisville, Ky.
Samson, T. S., D.D.....	Germantown, Pa.
Sanders, H. M., D.D.....	New York City.
Schulte, Mr. T. E.....	New York City.
Scott, Rev. Walter.....	South Windsor, Conn.
Shand, Mr. Miles M.....	Washington, D. C.
Slocum, Pres. A. G., LL.D.....	Kalamazoo, Mich.
Small, Prof. Albion W.....	Chicago, Ill.
Spalding, C. H., D.D.....	Boston, Mass.
Stevenson, Mr. Geo. K.....	Pittsburg, Pa.
Strong, Pres. A. H., D.D.....	Rochester, N. Y.
Stoddard, Ira J., D.D.....	Pella, Iowa.
Terry, Prof. B. L., Ph.D.....	Chicago Ill.
Thresher, Mr. E. M.....	Dayton, O.
Thresher, Mr. J. B.....	Dayton, O.
Tomlinson, Rev. E. T., Ph.D.....	Elizabeth, N. J.
Torrance, Hon. Francis J.....	Allegheny, Pa.
Tupper, K. B., D.D., LL.D.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
Upham, J. B., D.D.....	Boston, Mass.

Welch, Mr. Pierce N.....	New Haven, Conn.
White, Mr. E. D.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Williams, Rev. Leighton.....	New York City.
Wilson, Mr. B. F.....	Nashville, Tenn.
Woodburn, B. F., D.D.....	Allegheny, Pa.
Woods, E. A., D.D.....	Somerville, N. J.
Wishart, Rev. A. W.....	Trenton, N. J.

## LIST OF ANNUAL MEMBERS

---

Ashworth, Rev. Robt. A.....	Meriden, Conn.
Barry, Mr. Charles C.....	Melrose, Mass.
Bawden, Rev. Wm. H.....	New Haven, Conn.
Bawden, Mr. Wm.....	New York City.
Bickmore, Prof. A. S.....	New York City.
Bonsall, Rev. A. J.....	Rochester, Pa.
Bosworth, Rev. B. B.....	New York City.
Bradbury, Rev. Woodman.....	Cambridge, Mass.
Brown, Prof. C. R., D.D.....	Newton Centre, Mass.
Brown, Rev. John R.....	Providence, R. I.
Brown, T. Edwin, D.D.....	New Britain, Conn.
Bullen, George, D.D.....	New London, N. H.
Burton, N. S., D.D.....	Ann Arbor, Mich.
Bustard, Rev. W. W.....	Boston, Mass.
Butler, Prof. Nathaniel, D.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Carman, Rev. A. S.....	Granville, O.
Carver, Prof. W. O.....	Louisville, Ky.
Chard, Mr. James F.....	Buffalo, N. Y.
Colby, Mr. Gardner.....	New York City.
Conant, Mr. T. O., LL.D.....	New York City.
Dayton, Mr. A. A.....	Albany, N. Y.
Dewolf, Rev. D.....	Newark, N. J.
Dickerson, Mr. Frank.....	New York City.
Dickerson, Mr. J. S.....	Chicago, Ill.
Dickinson, J. T., D.D.....	Rochester, N. Y.
Downing, Mr. Amos W.....	Haverhill, Mass.

Eager, Prof. Geo. B., D.D.....Louisville, Ky.  
 Ennis, Mr. M. J.....New York City.  
 Fennell, Rev. W. G.....Newark, N. J.  
 Field, Rev. J. N.....Fort Wayne, Ind.  
 Foster, Rev. Allyn K.....Cornwall, Conn.  
 Francis, Rev. J. A.....New York City.  
 Garton, Rev. J. V.....West Somerville, Mass.  
 Grant, Mr. Schuyler.....Detroit, Mich.  
 Grenell, Z., D.D.....Detroit, Mich.  
 Grout, Mr. T. J.....New York City.  
 Harris, Pres. J. H., LL.D.....Lewisburg, Pa.  
 Harrison, Mr. William.....Louisville, Ky.  
 Hartwell, Mr. F. W.....Providence, R. I.  
 Hathaway, Mr. Frank R.....Yonkers, N. Y.  
 Hatt, Mr. Samuel S.....Albany, N. Y.  
 Henderson, Prof. C. R., D.D.....Chicago, Ill.  
 Henson, Rev. L. L.....Providence, R. I.  
 Holyoke, Rev. Edw.....Providence, R. I.  
 Johnson, Prof. Franklin, D.D.....Chicago, Ill.  
 Jutten, D. B., D.D.....Fall River, Mass.  
 Lasher, G. W., D.D.....Cincinnati, O.  
 Lowry, J. O. B., D.D.....Atlantic City, N. J.  
 Lyell, Rev. John W.....Camden, N. J.  
 Mabie, H. C., D.D.....Boston, Mass.  
 MacMurray, Rev. D. A.....New York City.  
 Magill, Rev. David T.....Milford, Mass.  
 Marble, Rev. F. E., Ph.D.....Cambridge, Mass.  
 Matthews, Prof. Shailer.....Chicago, Ill.  
 McGlothlin, Prof. W. J.....Louisville, Ky.  
 Merrill, Pres. Geo. E., D.D.....Hamilton, N. Y.  
 Merriam, E. F., D.D.....Boston, Mass.  
 Moody, Rev. Thomas.....Africa.  
 Moore, Mr. Wm. A.....Detroit, Mich.  
 Nash, Charles E., D.D.....New York City.  
 Needham, Pres. C. W.....Washington, D. C.  
 Neubauer, Rev. Eugene.....Bloomington, Ind.  
 Osborne, Rev. G. P.....Cincinnati, O.  
 Osborne, Mr. Thos. D.....Louisville, Ky.  
 Packer, Prof. E. E.....Albany, N. Y.  
 Parker, Rev. F. C. W.....Boston, Mass.  
 Partridge, Rev. Warren G.....Pittsburg, Pa.

Pattison, Rev. Harold.....Hartford, Conn.  
 Pinkham, Rev. Henry W.....Denver, Col.  
 Pollard, Prof. E. B., Ph.D.....Georgetown, Ky.  
 Purinton, Pres. D. B., D.D.....Morgantown, W. Va.  
  
 Rees, G. E., D.D.....Philadelphia, Pa.  
 Richardson, Rev. W. S.....New York City.  
 Robbins, Rev. G. R.....Cincinnati, O.  
  
 Scoville, Rev. A. E.....Melrose, Mass.  
 Shepardson, Rev. Daniel.....Newark, O.  
 Shirk, Mr. M.....Peru, Ind.  
 Sloper, Mr. A. J.....New Britain, Conn.  
 Stevens, Prof. W. A., D.D.....Rochester, N. Y.  
 Storey, Rev. C. R.....Albany, N. Y.  
 Strong, Rev. John Henry.....Rochester, N. Y.  
  
 Taylor, Pres. J. M., LL.D.....Poughkeepsie, N. Y.  
 Thomson, Hon. D. E., K.C.....Toronto, Canada.  
 Upham, A. G., D.D.....Fall River, Mass.  
  
 Vander Roest, Mr. Wm.....Pelham, N. Y.  
 Vose, Rev. Riley A.....Oswego, N. Y.  
  
 Waldron, Rev. J. Milton.....Jacksonville, Fla.  
 Wallace, Rev. W. B.....Utica, N. Y.  
 Watson, C. H., D.D.....Arlington, Mass.  
 Wilbur, Rev. J. Milnor.....Narbeth, Pa.  
 Williams, Prof. C. L.....Granville, O.  
 Williams, Mr. Mornay.....New York City.  
 Wishart, Rev. A. W.....Trenton, N. J.  
 Woods, Rev. F. C.....Upland, Pa.  
  
 Yager, Prof. Arthur, Ph.D.....Georgetown, Ky.



# Baptist Congress

## PLAN OF ORGANIZATION

1. **THE OBJECT** of the Congress is to promote a healthful sentiment among Baptists through free and courteous discussion of current questions by suitable persons.
2. **THE WORK** of the Congress shall be subject to the control of a General Committee of one hundred members or more. The Committee shall be composed of persons who have consented to contribute five dollars or more annually toward the expenses of the Congress.
3. **THE GENERAL COMMITTEE** shall elect a permanent Executive Committee of fifteen persons residing in or near the City of New York, at the meetings of which Executive Committee any member of the General Committee may be present and vote; and to this Executive Committee shall be intrusted, except as may have been already provided for by the General Committee, entire control over the public meetings—e. g., determinations of the time and place, the number of days and sessions each day, selection of the presiding officer, the topics, the appointed writers and speakers, the provision for volunteer speakers, and rules of discussion. The Executive Committee shall also secure a full stenographic report of the proceedings, and funds to meet any other necessary expense.
4. A **SECRETARY** shall be elected, who shall also be Secretary of the Executive Committee, and of the public meetings, the expenses of whose correspondence, etc., shall be met by a tax levied by the Executive Committee upon the General Committee.
5. **THE GENERAL COMMITTEE** shall meet in connection with the public meetings, and when called together by the Executive Committee.
6. **THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE** shall secure the appointment of a Local Committee in the city or town where a public meeting is to be held, which shall provide a suitable place for the Congress, entertainment for the officers and appointees of the Congress.
7. **ANY MEMBER** of a Baptist Congregation may become an Annual Member of this Congress, and thus be entitled to all its privileges, and to a copy of the published proceedings, by the payment of the sum of two dollars.

## RULES OF DISCUSSION

1. **THE CHAIRMAN** of the Congress shall be appointed by the Executive Committee, and on all points of order his decision shall be final.
2. **ANY MEMBER** of a Baptist Congregation who, by sending his card to the Secretary, shall signify his willingness to speak on the topic under discussion, may be called upon by the Chairman.
3. **ALL WRITERS** and speakers shall take the platform, address only the Chair, and confine themselves to the subject assigned for the occasion.
4. **NO PERSON** shall speak twice on the same subject.
5. **READERS OF PAPERS** shall be allowed twenty-five minutes, appointed speakers\* twenty minutes, and volunteer speakers ten minutes. The Secretary shall notify all participants by stroke of the bell three minutes before, and also at the expiration of their time, beyond which no one shall be allowed to proceed.
6. **NO PAPER** shall be read in the absence of its writer, nor shall any paper be printed in the proceedings except it has been read at the meeting.
7. **NO RESOLUTION** or motion shall be entertained at the public conferences.

\* Appointed speakers must not use MS., the object of their appointment being to encourage the volunteer discussion which follows their addresses.

PROCEEDINGS  
OF  
THE BAPTIST CONGRESS

1905

---

FIRST DAY.

*Afternoon Session.*

THE WALNUT HILLS BAPTIST CHURCH, CINCINNATI, O.

Tuesday, November 14, 1905.

3 P. M.

---

REV. GEORGE WILLIAM LASHER, D.D.: Brethren: you are here on the invitation of the Cincinnati Baptist Social Union, and the Cincinnati Baptist Ministers' Conference. No member of either of those organizations can be a member of the other. We are informed by the Secretary of the Congress that we are expected to name the President and two Vice-Presidents for this meeting. And, it becomes my privilege, as Chairman of the joint Committee, to report and name as President of this Congress, Mr. Gershom M. Peters, A.M., whom Cincinnati Baptists highly esteem and delight to honor, and who comes as near being eligible to both the Social Union and the Ministers' Conference as any man can: as Vice-Presidents, we name John R. Spencer, M.D., at one time President of the Social Union, and Rev. Grover P. Osborne, A.M., sometime President of the Ministers' Conference.

I have the pleasure of introducing to you, Mr. G. M. Peters, President of the Congress.

THE PRESIDENT: We will be led in prayer by Rev. Dr. Augustine S. Carman of Dennison.

REV. A. S. CARMAN, D.D.:

## PRAYER.

O God, Our Father, we thank thee for this unity to which we have come, the unity of heart with a common hope and aspiration. We thank thee also, because of the diversity which thou hast granted us in unity, for the freedom of thought; for the opportunity to work out each in the line of his own individuality. We thank thee, O God, for that knowledge of truth which has run throughout the ages; we thank thee for the adaptability of this truth to change of scene and circumstances. Bless, we pray thee, the deliberations of this body. Bless those who bring to us the result of their thought. Bless those who shall ask for light and guidance out of the fulness of their hearts. In Jesus' name we pray for thy blessing on this gathering. Amen.

THE PRESIDENT: We now have an address of welcome by Brother D. B. Meacham, who is to welcome us to the hospitality of this city.

MR. D. B. MEACHAM: *Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:* It gives me great pleasure to welcome you to the old orthodox Baptist Association. At present, I am a Presbyterian. It is unnecessary for me to say this Congress is welcome to the city of Cincinnati.

During the past twenty-five years we have heard of men, honest men of all kinds, forming organizations and then holding conventions and congresses. Labor has organized unions, has held its conventions, to have shorter hours and longer pay. Capital has organized itself for the purpose of keeping wages where they were and getting more efficient work. Merchants have organized and held their conventions, to consider means by which they could collect debts; then a whole lot of people have got together with a purpose of spending their money so that there would not be anything left to pay debts.

Now there have been occasions of assembly in this city, where the leading city official extended the key to the corporation, and notified the people assembled that the police had been instructed, if necessary, to see them safely home at night. This certainly is an assurance you will not need, and it is certainly a pleasure and great honor to extend to a congress like this, assembled to deliberate upon matters of the highest spiritual and moral welfare of humanity, a cordial and heartfelt welcome.

Regarding our city of Cincinnati, to which you are now invited, it is unnecessary for me to tell you about the places of interest, or about her great musical institution, which is international in its char-

acter; her shops and mercantile interests and great manufactories known around the globe.

If I had been called upon two weeks ago to have spoken about our political situation I should not have entertained you with pleasant statements, but I am happy to say a new impulse has been given by the citizens in this great city, and we seem to have profited by the wave of reform that swept over the country; and I may say, I believe that these better conditions will continue.

Thirty-six years ago I came to Cincinnati, and while I have lived here I have been identified with a number of churches and have known something of the worshippers in the churches. I believe that the revolution is not as great in church life as in our political life; but I believe Cincinnati has grown better every year; it has a better place in the ministry and in our work of conversion.

It has been my fortune to be connected with the Young Men's Christian Association, and during that time we had great difficulty in procuring a general secretary. We found Cincinnati and one other city occupying the lowest position in the statistics of the Young Men's Christian Association. We found a man out on the Pacific coast whom we obtained, and he has carried on satisfactorily the business since coming here. The membership has largely increased and a great deal of work has been done for physical, moral and mental development; the report of each year shows a gain over the preceding year, and we take pride in our work. And, I may say that our secretary is largely responsible for this work. He was a Baptist student trained in California before we secured him.

So, I think, from all points of view we may welcome you to a city growing better, and, in conclusion, I can only say that this assembly and all other assemblies of the same kind will always find that Cincinnati will welcome them with open hearts. I hope your deliberations will prove even more successful than you now anticipate.

THE PRESIDENT: The welcome on behalf of the Christian community will be extended by Rev. Wm. McKibbin, D.D., President of Lane Seminary.

REV. WILLIAM MCKIBBIN, D.D., LL.D., President of Lane Seminary:

*Mr. President, and Brethren of the Baptist Congress:* It is a very great pleasure to me to present to you, in the name of the

Christian Community of Cincinnati, a most cordial welcome to our city.

The general feeling which I express, and in which I share, is heightened in me personally, by reason of the fact that the Presbyterian Institution over which I have the honor to preside bears the name of two brothers, Baptist laymen, who early in the last century, profoundly impressed with the need of ministers of the Gospel in the West and Southwest, offered to their Baptist brethren four thousand dollars, the business profits of four years, on condition that they would establish a training-school for ministers in this region, and, upon their inability to accept it, made the same proposal to the Presbyterians, who accepted it.

In recognition of these generous donors their names were given to the institution established in part by their gifts, and a provision made in its charter that its educational advantages should be open to candidates for the ministry, irrespective of their denominational affiliations.

But upon a broader ground, with the Christian community of our city, I welcome you because of the debt which morally and spiritually the entire church and community in this region owes to the wondrous work which you have wrought in our midst. In every form of Christian activity you have borne a prominent part, and contributed no inconsiderable element to its success.

Two, at least, of your churches, in dealing with the downtown church problem, and in reaching the floating elements in our population, have furnished models which all who are interested in these phases of church service may wisely study.

While thus zealously pursuing your own distinctive work as a church, you have joined heartily in all religious and moral enterprises requiring the united action of the Church as a whole.

But upon still wider grounds I welcome you: in view of the contribution you have made to the life and power of the Church of Christ in this and other lands. We cannot forget that the modern Foreign Missionary movement found one of its earliest embodiments in the heart and consecrated service of a Baptist, nor that some of the greatest triumphs won by the Church in the destitute and neglected fields in our land, have been won by you. And last, but not least, representing a city noted for its institutions of learning, its schools of art and music, and its general culture, I welcome you for the contributions which you, as Baptists, have

made to the educational world, and the intellectual enrichment which you have brought to the nation and the Church.

From all indications it seems to be decreed that you should remain and bear more abundant fruit. With this decree I have no difficulty: whatever mystery shrouds the general subject of decrees, this seems to me perfectly luminous—and I am happy to say that I think a similar decree has gone forth concerning my own and other branches of the universal Church.

Criticism made upon denominationalism, from the standpoint of Christian unity, often overlooks some very important facts:

1. That every great denomination which has secured and maintained a continuous place and work in the world has enriched the Christly life by presenting new and complemental types of that life, and has enlarged the sphere of applied Christianity by reaching areas of population unreached by other churches previous to their advent.

2. That while denominational births have been the resultants, in a sense, of controversy, the controversy has originated and reached its greatest heat in the undivided organization, diverted its energies from aggressive work, while the formation of a new body has lessened and finally eliminated the controversial spirit, turned antagonism into harmony, and allowed both the old and the new organizations to devote their energies to enlarging the kingdom under the not always unhealthy stimulus of an honorable rivalry.

In no city does a higher degree of harmony and coöperation exist among the different churches than in Cincinnati; but, notwithstanding all this, I should not wish to take any risk upon the continuance of this happy state of affairs, if they were all again in one organic body. But I can now, in the name of this harmonious church community, welcome you to our city with great heartiness and sincerity.

THE PRESIDENT: Brother Herget of the Ninth Street Baptist Church of this city will welcome you on behalf of the Baptist churches.

REV. JOHN F. HERGET: *Mr. President, Brethren and Sisters:* One year ago this month it was my pleasure to be the messenger bearing an invitation to the Baptist Congress, which was then in session at Louisville, to meet in Cincinnati this year as the guest of

the Cincinnati Baptist Social Union and the Baptist Ministers' Conference. It now affords me increased pleasure to welcome the Congress to Cincinnati on behalf of all the Baptist Churches and pastors of this city.

The other day Rev. Sam Jones, in addressing the ministers of this city, said: "Brethren, I do not ask for your endorsement. If I were to ask you to endorse me, I should have to endorse you, and that is something I can't do. But I do ask for your sympathy and your coöperation." That is the spirit which characterizes the Baptist pastors and churches of Cincinnati in their relations to one another. So far as I know, there is not a Baptist pastor in this city who is willing to give his unqualified endorsement to everything his fellow pastors say or do. So far as I know, there is no Baptist church here that is willing to give its unqualified endorsement to all the methods of work employed by the other churches. But there is one thing we do have in an unusual degree, and that is, sweet Christian fellowship and a spirit of willingness to coöperate with one another in every good work of the Lord.

That, I believe, is also the spirit of the Baptist Congress. You do not ask us to endorse everything that may be said—that we may not be able to do; but you do desire our sympathy and coöperation in making this session of the Congress pleasant and profitable, and this you shall have.

We do not promise to applaud all that you say. I have found that when the Baptists of Cincinnati applaud, they do so, not to flatter, but as an evidence of their approval. A few months ago while attending the Baptist Congress in London I saw something that impressed me with the fact that applause is frequently without meaning. A speaker was giving utterance to some views not in accord with my own. On the pew in front of me were several young men who were applauding quite vigorously. A few moments later another speaker was giving utterance to views diametrically opposed to those of the first speaker, when the same young men applauded just as generously. Their approval being without discrimination was worthless.

If we do not like what you say, we may follow the example of a certain old lady in this city. Although over seventy years old, she had never learned to use the telephone, and asked a young man who was present to give her some instructions. He directed her to put the receiver to her ear, and, when "Central" replied, to call for

a certain number, which happened to be that of a young man friend. She waited patiently until the young man responded, when she placed the receiver against the transmitter and allowed him to talk to himself. If we find that we cannot approve what you say we will not get angry, but we may hold the receiver to the transmitter and allow you to talk to yourselves.

Some years ago I heard Dr. H. M. Wharton tell the story of a young minister who had been married but a short while. One evening he walked home by the side of his wife in silence, feeling that his sermon had been an utter failure. After reaching home, he sat down with elbows resting on the table and his face in his hands, the very picture of dejection and even of despondency. His young and inexperienced wife, feeling that it was her duty to comfort him, but not knowing just what to say, put her arms about his neck, and with soothing voice said: "Never mind, dear, you are sweet if you are not smart." So, brethren of the Congress, whatever may be your opinion of our smartness and of our intellectual stature, we hope, at least, that during your brief stay with us, you may be convinced of our kindness of heart and of the cordiality of our hospitality.

In behalf, therefore, of the Baptist pastors of Cincinnati, as royal a set of ministers of Christ as it has ever been my privilege to labor with, and in behalf of the Baptist churches of this city, as faithful a set of churches in the service of the Master as I have ever known, I extend to you a most cordial welcome to our churches, to our homes, and to our hearts.

THE PRESIDENT: *Brethren of the Baptist Congress*: I appreciate very much the honor of being asked to preside at your meetings. But it would seem to me much more fitting for some one to preside who should be regularly elected by your body, and who should be from a distance, if for no other reason, that he might properly reply to the speeches of welcome. Take the present instance. Really, it is quite embarrassing for me to reply to these very kind addresses of welcome. It is a good deal like myself welcoming myself, and then making a cordial reply to myself. Now, here is Brother Meacham, who has welcomed us as a citizen of Cincinnati. I am a citizen of Cincinnati myself, though I do not claim to have lived here as long as he, nor to have attained as honorable position. Dr. McKibbin welcomes us to this Christian



community. I have been a member of this Christian community much longer than he. And Rev. Mr. Herget cordially receives us on behalf of the Baptists of this city. I have been a member of this Baptist fellowship long before Brother Herget knew it or was known by it. However, I will try to divest myself of my own personality and assume that of the Congress, though I greatly fear I shall become fatally twisted and perhaps fall down in an attempt at such mental gymnastics.

We are very thankful to Mr. Meacham (who, by the way, has been obliged to withdraw on account of his engagements), for turning over to us in such a kindly and graceful manner the keys of the city. We shall try to use them with discretion and return them safely on our departure. We shall now feel free to go where we please in the city, even though some of us may look a little suspicious in the eyes of the police. We wish that Mr. Meacham had attached to these keys an airship, by which we might sail aloft and view the city from a height sufficient to take it in in its wide extent. If we could only get a comprehensive view of this great city, see how it scrambles over the hills, and spreads for miles away through the valleys, bursting beyond its corporate limits on every side, we are certain that Cleveland would look small, and that the Cleveland men who are here, if they could get such a sight, would feel small. When we were boys we learned from our old geographies that Cincinnati was noted for its beautiful suburbs. If we can have the time between sessions, and have sufficient strength left, after our exhausting discussions, we shall be glad to see some of these beautiful suburbs. We should like to stroll through Burnet Woods and Eden Park, and go to our celebrated "Zoo" and perhaps renew acquaintance with some of our ancient kinsmen there. We should like to visit the University here, the School of Design, the Museum of Art, the far famed Rookwood Pottery, the College of Music and its great Auditorium. We should like to go through some of your splendid public buildings and climb some of your skyscrapers. We should like also to visit the Young Men's Christian Association, of which Mr. Meacham is, and has been for years, the honored President. We should like to see how an ironmaster runs a Christian Association. We should like to see his night schools, his religious meetings, and the many methods employed for saving the young men of this city. Again, we thank Mr. Meacham for his kind words. May God's blessing be upon him and his many endeavors for good.

We are thankful to Dr. McKibbin for his kindly expressions of Christian fellowship and his welcome to this Christian community. We know it is a very large and a very active body, even though they say this is a very wicked city. We are glad to be welcomed by the President of Lane Theological Seminary. We have long heard of this school, and now that we are sitting under its shadow we feel ourselves highly favored. We believe orthodoxy has not always been "preserved" in your school, but that does not greatly disturb us; you are built on Baptist grounds and have had a good Baptist beginning, and certainly can not go very far astray. We remember the name "Beecher" in connection with your institution, and are pleased to know that we are on such historic ground. Had we time, we should like to stroll by the old house, once in the woods, now on one of your finest avenues, where Dr. Lyman Beecher lived, and where he used to stamp, and fume, and shake his fist at the theological and political world lying outside his picket fence. We should like to go around and see that back door where the fugitive slave used to come in the dusk of the evening, all trembling with fright, and pour out his tale of woe in the sympathetic ear of Harriet Beecher, and where she gained inspiration for that work which proved to be one of the mightiest forces of her time. We should like to see where Henry Ward Beecher frolicked when a boy. Where he tried to study theology and made such a poor out of it, and where he quickly possessed himself of the ark containing the law, or rather the venerated principles of sacred rhetoric, the rules of preaching, which he proceeded at once to smash into smithereens, and to strike out for himself in a way not only to startle the staid old Presbyterians, but to astonish the world. On this, and many accounts, we rejoice that we are in such a goodly Christian community and are made so welcome.

And now, Brother Herget, we thank you for the good Baptist heart you have shown us. We hope you will continue to think well of us. We hope you and your Baptist brethren here will not feel strained or embarrassed in your relations with us. We know you have been brought up under the shadow of the "Journal and Messenger," and at the feet of that Gamaliel, who is noted for his strict adherence to the traditions of the Elders and the Letter of the Law. We are glad to note that you do not take us too seriously. We do not take ourselves very seriously. Remember, we speak not as representatives, but each for himself, so that you may not be

burdened with the thought that you may be lending your hand to something that will do you or the denomination irreparable harm. This Congress gives us an opportunity to free our minds and to get a little exercise in those fields of thought that may lie near the dangerous edge, into which we are often tempted to go, but which are hardly suitable for the pulpit or the class-room. Here we can have our say and relieve our minds, and then what we say is neatly printed and tucked away in a neat little volume, and is laid away, buried as it were. Nobody is harmed. The great denomination strides on its sturdy way, utterly unaware that anything has dropped. So there is nothing that need interfere with the hearty exchange of fellowship between us.

And now swinging back into myself, let me also welcome you, brethren of this Congress, both as a member of this church and as spokesman of the local committee. We hope you will not feel embarrassed because there floats over you at this time the Baptist sheet referred to, or because its senior editor is present. He is not nearly so dangerous as the bark of his pen would seem to indicate. Really, he is one of the very kindest of men, and even now is forgiving me in his heart for what I am saying. He loves his brethren; he loves them so much that he can not bear to have them do or say a single naughty thing. Indeed, if one assumes to be the defender of "the faith once delivered to the Saints," he must needs carry a "big stick"; otherwise, he cannot promote peace. If there were not some one to handle grandfather's cane and bring it down once in a while on the floor with a "tut, tut, stop that noise," we should not quite feel at home.

As a member of this church, permit me to say we welcome you. We have invited you to come up to this high hill for your deliberations, where the atmosphere is purer and the sunlight is brighter. We hope, thereby, that you may be enabled to gain clearer visions and brighter aspects of truth, of God, and of Christ. May this prove to be to you a very Mount of Transfiguration.

THE SECRETARY then read the Rules of Discussion.

THE PRESIDENT: I am very glad that the Secretary is to notify the speakers, as I do not have to take that responsibility, except to say that I hope, when the Secretary taps the bell you will understand that you are to stop.

We are now to discuss the question: "What is the Ethical Value of the Old Testament in Modern Life?" The writers are Prof. W. R. Betteridge, Rochester, N. Y., and Rev. Theo. G. Soares, Ph.D., Oak Park, Ill.

We will first hear from Prof. Betteridge:

PROF. W. R. BETTERIDGE, of Rochester University, presented the following paper:

### "WHAT IS THE ETHICAL VALUE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN MODERN LIFE?"

The framers of our program devote a whole session to the consideration of a question which many modern writers would dispose of in a moment. Why ask what is the ethical value of the Old Testament in modern life? Why not admit frankly that it has none? And if it has no ethical value then its present significance is only that which attaches to the record of any outgrown stage in human development. And it is precisely because of its moral shortcomings that this harsh judgment is usually passed. It is chiefly on this account that Prof. Goldwin Smith calls the Old Testament the millstone about the neck of the church from which she is busily trying to free herself, and which she must cast off if she is to continue to thrive and prosper, and only the other day Prof. A. H. Keane declared that it is impossible to claim any inspiration for the Old Testament records, for an inspired record could not possibly ascribe to God the qualities which in the Old Testament are ascribed to Jehovah. For we recognize the justice of the demand that the Old Testament like other books shall submit itself to the ethical test and show by its fruits what it is capable of producing in the moral realm. Its claim to be the record of a religious revelation will secure for it but scant reverence if it has little or no effect on character. Now we may as well acknowledge at the outset that there is much in the Old Testament which is repugnant to our moral sense. From the point of view both of precept and of principle, its morality must be admitted to be in part, at least, outgrown and superseded. The death knell of much of its ethics was sounded when our Lord said to his disciples: "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time,—but I say unto you." But at the same time we must respectfully protest against this summary

ruling which puts the Old Testament so peremptorily out of court as a source of ethical information and inspiration. With all its imperfections it is yet one of the most impressive records of moral and religious progress that the world contains. This, of itself, implies the presence of sound pedagogical principles which should aid us in dealing with the moral problems of our own times. And when we consider that the result of the moral progress was the attainment of a moral altitude, such as we see shining before us in these noble words of Micah: "He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" it becomes evident that the Old Testament may imply certain ethical principles which it is worth our while to consider. I say imply advisedly, because the Old Testament is not a text book in ethics any more than it is a text book in any other science. It is the record of progressively unfolding life, but that life as it develops is dominated by certain great ethical principles, for whatever else they may teach, lawgiver, prophet and sage throughout the Old Testament insist on the paramount importance of conduct. And it is for these principles that we must seek in attempting to give an answer to the question which is before us for discussion. I propose, therefore, that we put the Old Testament in the witness box and from it learn the answers which it gives to one or two of the fundamental problems of ethical inquiry.

We naturally ask, in the first place, what in the teaching of the Old Testament is the ground of moral obligation? The answer is clear and unequivocal, it is expressed in terms of personality, it is the will of a personal God. "Right is right, because God is God." This thought is prominent through the whole history of Israel, in the earlier and lower as well as in the later and loftier stages of their moral progress. From one point of view Israel's moral and religious development might be defined as a progressive apprehension of the nature and character of God. This accounts for the unworthy moral qualities which are ascribed to Jehovah in some of the records; the men and women whose ideals are recorded had only imperfectly learned God. It also accounts for the fact that as the conception of the moral character of Jehovah grew in clearness and dignity, the moral perception of Israel's teachers rule in clearness, and consequently their demands upon their contemporaries for upright living became more and more insistent. There

is no uncertainty in the Old Testament as to the logical relation of these two phases of the moral progress. The character of Jehovah did not grow in moral grandeur as and because the moral ideals of the people were raised, but the revelation of the character of Jehovah always went on in advance, and as the revelation became purer and clearer, and because it was purer and clearer, the moral ideals which were set before the people were correspondingly purified. The intense moral earnestness of the prophets is inspired by their vision of the holy and righteous Jehovah. God is for them no abstraction. Jehovah is a living personal being, who has redeemed Israel to be a select people, a holy nation; and therefore Israel's whole law, moral as well as ceremonial, is based on the will of him who has redeemed them for himself. This fact made it forever impossible for the Old Testament lawgiver, prophet, or sage to separate ethics from religion. The moral imperative finds its only and sufficient sanction in the revealed will of Jehovah. It was not strange, therefore, that the Rabbis included within their ten words the fundamental declaration: "I am Jehovah thy God, who brought thee up out of the land of Egypt." In a very real sense the ten commandments are only the ethical and religious corollary of this great fact of redemption. Israel's moral life is based, not on utilitarian considerations, whether those considerations are narrowly selfish or include the greatest good of the greatest number, but upon the model set before them in the character of their God. "Ye shall be holy, for I am holy" is the fundamental principle in their moral life. When it is said of Jehovah: "Jehovah, Jehovah, a God full of compassion and gracious; slow to anger and plenteous in mercy and truth; keeping mercy for thousands; forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin," there was set before Israel the writer's ideal of goodness. It is as if it were said: "The highest possible character we can know must be ever compassionate, ever gracious, patient, loving and forgiving even to thousands of offenders." (See Duff, *Theology and Ethics of the Old Testament*, page 37.)

By thus placing ethics on a distinctly religious basis, a super-human sanction for moral conduct was secured, and the way was opened for unlimited progress. It is probably not too much to say that the moral elevation of Christian civilization has been secured in large measure because Christian civilization has based itself distinctly upon the old Hebrew conception that the will of a holy God is the true ground of moral obligation. This, you will recall, is

practically the thesis of Mr. Benjamin Kidd in his work on Social Evolution. He maintains that the idea of a supernatural sanction for morals and for altruism has been the indispensable condition for the social evolution of the race. And when we ask ourselves whether, with all our advance in science during the past century, we have been able to discover any satisfactory substitute for this ancient Hebrew conception, we are met with an emphatic negative. Up to date no substitute for the theistic basis has been found. Consequently even Professor Goldwin Smith, who feels that the theistic basis must be given up, looks forward with anything but equanimity to the bad quarter of an hour which society must endure when the transfer from the old basis for morals to some other undiscovered undefined basis is being made. And the admissions of Professor Huxley in his Romanes lecture on Evolution and Ethics are even more significant. As a thoroughgoing agnostic, Professor Huxley knows nothing of theism, and so can not find a theistic basis for morals. The result is that he finds himself forced to posit an inexplicable antinomy between what he calls the cosmic process and the ethical process. These two processes are working in direct opposition to each other, and his discussion ends in a *cul-de-sac* from which he sees no possible way of escape. And this is not to be wondered at, for from the point of view of empirical science we can only recognize and register the fact of an unexplained ethical law or process by virtue of which man sets himself deliberately and continually in opposition to the cosmic process. Nor is the antinomy dissolved by the assertion that the ethical process is itself the product of the cosmic process. So long as we deal with processes we must grope in the dark. And this is the verdict which we are obliged to pass upon the various forms of the so-called utilitarian ethics. However much they may seek to disguise the fact by elaborate phraseology, the adherents of these types of ethical philosophy are inevitably forced into the same *cul-de-sac* as that in which Professor Huxley found himself involved. It seems impossible to escape this insoluble problem without making at least what Professor Seth (Study of Ethical Principles, p. 389 ff.) calls the metaphysical implication of God, for God is the necessary philosophical presupposition for all ethical progress.

This conclusion which we have reached from the consideration of the theoretical philosophical phase of the problem is reaffirmed with solemn emphasis by the practical experience of history. Let me cite

one or two examples. Benjamin Franklin observed that without religion, morality gives way sooner or later, and that there can be no adequate basis for the insistence even upon common honesty and common decency if the religious sanction is finally and wholly removed. And even more significant is the fact, recently cited by Mrs. Louise Seymour Houghton, in her valuable book on "Telling Bible Stories," with regard to the experience of France in the period succeeding the establishment of the third republic in 1870. The desire of the founders of the republic to free themselves from the domination of the church led them to provide a series of text books on morals in which there was no mention of or reference to God, and from which the religious element was scrupulously eliminated. These books were used for ten years, and the result was the development of such a pessimistic spirit among the children that all their joy in living was taken away; and most significant of all from the point of view of morals, an epidemic of crime and suicide broke out among the children, so that the authorities appointed a free-thinking scientific man to investigate the problem. His conclusion was that the children who had no knowledge of God were inevitably overcome by a profound soul discouragement. As a result of this report, in sheer self defense, in order to preserve the spirit of the rising generation, the religious element in instruction had to be restored.

May we not cite another more practical instance and see in the financial, industrial and social evils of our times the natural consequence of the practical disregard of God which is prevalent? At all events the Old Testament teaching is plain. It insists that if we are to have the good fruit of a moral life we must see to it that the tree has its roots striking deep into the soil of a religious faith.

The obvious objection to this conclusion is that religion is no pledge of morality. The truth of this objection is immediately recognized in the case of non-Christian Oriental religions. In a recent letter the Rev. W. W. Cochrane says that the people among whom he is working need to learn that religion is more than an idol and a yellow robe, and that worship is more than a posture and the mumbling of prayers. And in the sprightly book, entitled, "In a Syrian Saddle," the author refers to the absolute irrelevance of religion to life which seems to characterize Mohammedan society. But this irrelevance is not exclusively non-Christian. James protests against it when he says that faith without works is dead.



Nor is it exclusively Oriental or ancient. It is present to-day, clogging the wheels of Christian progress and hampering Christian activity. The profession of adherence to the Christian faith is no assurance of business integrity or of purity in public and private life. The characteristic villain of the popular modern novel is the prosperous, smug, self-satisfied church member. It is even hailed with a note of surprise, as though, forsooth, it were something new that the great Welsh revival of religion has been accompanied by an equally remarkable revival in public and private morals. Our own Professor Rauschenbusch, and more recently Principal Lindsay, have done a good service in pointing out that every great revival of religion has had as its necessary and inseparable consequence a revival in morals. Now, as ever, true religion produces a lofty type of morality. And the difficulty of the present is primarily with our religion and only secondarily with our morals, as we see when we read our Old Testament with open minds. The moral enthusiasm of the prophets of Israel has never been surpassed. And it is based on a devotion to the religion of Jehovah which gives them the martyr spirit. 'In the name of Jehovah, and inspired by their intense religious zeal, they delivered their burning philippics against their contemporaries who, like the modern Moslem and too many professing Christians, had divorced their religious professions from their everyday life. When Amos would set before the people the service which Jehovah demands, he says: "Let justice roll down like water, and righteousness like a never failing stream." Hosea asserts that Jehovah desires mercy, and not sacrifice, and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings. And Isaiah indignantly declares that the sacrificial festivals and all the religious services of Israel are hateful in the sight of Jehovah. Even the prayers of the assembled multitudes do not rise above their own heads. "Yea, when ye make many prayers, I will not hear you, for your hands are full of blood. Wash you, make you clean, put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil, learn to do well; seek justice, relieve the oppressed, secure justice for the fatherless, plead the cause of the widow." And the Psalmist says that the man who may hope to ascend into the holy hill of Zion and to be accepted of Jehovah is the man who 'walketh uprightly and worketh righteousness and speaketh the truth in his heart.

The value of this union between religion and ethics for the life of to-day is so plain that it would scarcely seem to need further

emphasis. Against both of the tendencies which are so evident at present to separate ethics from religion on the one hand, and to separate religion from ethics on the other, the Old Testament furnishes us with the most effective weapons. I can not do better in closing the discussion of this point than to quote from an editorial utterance of the *Outlook* for July 8, 1905: "Only as ethical culture and religious feeling are combined," the writer asserts, "only as a regard for the welfare of our neighbor is reinforced by a feeling of loyalty and reverence to God, and only as reverence for God is directed into practical channels of service to men, is education made adequate, and a practically powerful moral character produced. Man is incurably religious, and it is only as the great humanitarian movements for industrial and social betterment are inspired with something like the enthusiasm of the ancient prophets, which was a profoundly religious enthusiasm, that they will be either radically beneficial or permanently powerful."

In the second place, the Old Testament furnishes us with a perfectly clear and definite answer to another of the great problems of ethical investigation. What, asks the moral philosopher, is the *summum bonum*, what is the ideal which we should strive to attain? A perfect correspondence to the will and purpose of God is the answer which the Old Testament offers. For the idea of law and a moral order is just as prominent in the Old Testament as is the idea of God. In fact the conception of a moral order is a necessary corollary of the belief in a personal, righteous, omnipotent God. We mistake when we confine the term "law" in the Old Testament to the Pentateuch, and so think of it as chiefly ritualistic and ceremonial. Law is the expression of the will of Jehovah, and to it both individual and nation were bound to conform. And even the ceremonial requirements are only an elaborate attempt to set forth by type and symbol, and in accordance with the genius of the Semitic mind, the great fundamental fact that the chief business of man as an individual, and more particularly as a member of an organized body or community, was to conform to the moral requirements of the God to whom he owed his individual and national life. It would be easy to show how this conception of a moral order dominates the thought of the prophets. In the impressive survey of the nations of Syria with which the prophecy of Amos opens, the doom irrevocable which hangs over them all is threatened because they, one and all, have acted contrary to the righteous will of the Sovereign of the

world. In essence, at least, the petition in the prayer which our Lord taught his disciples, "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done," is the ideal of the Old Testament. Conformity to the will of God is conformity to the moral order of the universe, and this conformity is righteousness. Nor does God set up a standard to which he himself pays no heed. His own self-consistency demands that he be true to the requirements of his moral nature, and forbids him to violate his own covenant and promises. Hence, the righteousness of God becomes for despondent and repentant Israel the most certain guarantee of her redemption and salvation, so that righteousness in many of the Psalms, and in the latter part of the book of Isaiah, comes to be practically a synonym for grace and redemption.

As conformity to the will of God is righteousness, which exalts a nation and brings blessing both to the individual and the nation, so lack of conformity is sin. Sin may be regarded as missing the mark, a simple failure to conform, or it may be viewed as a deliberate and wilful refusal to conform, transgressions, and apostasy; with all that these words imply; or it may be considered as a twisting or perversion of the truth, the deviation from the straight line, and the adoption of crooked and twisted ways. However viewed, sin is always a failure, either unintentional or wilful, to conform to the revelation of the righteous will of God, whether that revelation has been made, as Paul suggests, in nature, so that the invisible things of him since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made; or whether it be made in the more perfect revelation of himself which he has given in his law. And since the righteous God rules the world in righteousness this lack of conformity inevitably brings with it its own penalty. The righteousness of God reacts with crushing force against every violation of his righteous law, and vindicates itself by destroying the sinner, whether that sinner be a nation or an individual. So Amos, speaking for Jehovah, says: "I will utterly destroy the sinful kingdom." And so the Psalmist declares that God, the righteous judge, hath indignation every day. He is righteous, and upon the wicked he will rain snares. When Jehovah manifests himself against the pride and lofty sinfulness of men, Isaiah says he will be exalted in judgment and sanctified in righteousness. When he comes forth with his destroying judgment, it is because a consummation overflowing with righteousness has been determined upon. Judgment is the line, and righteousness is the plummet when

Jehovah sends forth his hail to sweep away the refuge of lies and his waters to overflow the hiding place. But it is not necessary to multiply instances nor to accumulate evidence of the fact that the Old Testament is dominated by the sense of a righteous law, which is supreme in the world, and to which men are under obligation to conform.

It may, however, be urged that the Old Testament morality is external, arbitrary and mechanical. By setting up a purely external standard it violates the true autonomy of the moral life, because man is called upon to yield the control of his life to something outside of and beyond his true nature of rational selfhood. (Cf. Seth, Study, p. 212.) Conformity, it may be urged, which is secured by fear of a penalty, is no true conformity, for is the man who is honest because honesty is the best policy really honest at all? True morality exists only when the disposition is so transformed that the external command and the internal compulsion of the soul coincide; when what I ought to do, what the law commands me to do becomes also my delight. It may readily be admitted that the Old Testament is sometimes open to this charge. The element of fear is too often the motive to obedience to make its ideal permanently applicable, though we may recognize its adaptation to the conditions and the needs of the time. The emphasis laid upon the external standard did, perhaps, make the people of the Old Testament dispensation peculiarly liable to the temptation to render a formal and external, rather than real and inner, obedience. Our Lord found it necessary to reiterate many of the old commandments, and to insist that the obedience demanded was the spiritual obedience of the heart. But admitting, as we must, some justice in the charge we still insist that the Old Testament in its highest points is raised far above all suspicion of externality. For the ideal Israelite, and in the ideal society of the future, the law shall cease to be external, written upon tables of stone, and shall become internal, engraved upon the fleshly tablets of the heart. Then the will of the Lord becomes the will of his servant, who can say, "O, how I love thy law, and I delight to do thy will, O God." The purposes and the aims of the human and of the divine wills coincide. In that remarkable penitential Psalm, the 51st, the Psalmist recognizes the demand for something more than a mere external conformity to God's law. "Behold thou desirest truth in the inward parts, and in the hidden parts thou shalt make me to know wisdom. Create in

me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me" are certainly expressions of a longing for spiritual purification and renewal which is sufficiently thoroughgoing to fit it to serve as the prayer of the most devout and spiritually minded soul even in our Christian age with all the light of nineteen centuries of Christian teaching to illuminate our pathway.

The Old Testament makes a practical application of this fundamental moral order to the ideals of life for the individual, the family and the state. Our time will not permit us to consider its effect upon the family and the individual. We can pause only to consider its relation to the community or the state, for it is just here that the emphasis is laid by the Old Testament itself. The laws and principles of the divine government are intended according to the teaching of the prophets to become the controlling force in human society, and more specifically in the Israelitish Messianic kingdom. And even when the prophets had been taught the sad lesson, which at the risk of their lives they delivered to their contemporaries, that the existing state was doomed because of its utter incapacity to make real the principles of the divine government, they yet looked forward to the establishment of a new society raised on the crumbling ruins of the old which should give formal expression to the will of God on earth. The Israelitish state in some form or other as a political organization was for them the means for the establishment of the kingdom of God, and they expected it to be extended by the voluntary adherence of foreign nations to its dominion. This is the significance of the prediction which has been preserved in both the prophecy of Micah and that of Isaiah about the elevation of Zion to the place of sovereignty in the whole world, because she had the knowledge of God, and from her all nations were to learn the principles of the divine law, and to receive a just settlement of all their disputes, so that "The war drums should beat no longer, and the battle flags be furled, In the Parliament of nations, the Federation of the world."

Is it necessary to ask whether the Old Testament conception of the majesty of law, of the demands of the righteous order to which men and nations are under obligation to conform, and which they disregard at their peril, is of any value in modern life? If there is any one outstanding characteristic of modern life, individual and social, it is its contempt for and disregard of law. It would

almost seem as though, with the wide extension of the conception of law in the physical world, the sense of its moral significance was in danger of being lost. Even the casual reader of the newspaper or the most superficial moralist must be impressed with the fact. From the child in the primary school to such Napoleons of finance as the presidents and managers of the great life insurance companies, the most open disregard of authority, and evasion, and even defiance of law are the striking features of life. We are taught that the only authority which a man can recognize is the authority of his own personality, that each man must control himself in working out his own destiny in accordance with the laws of his own personality, which we may admit is a very lofty ethical ideal, but practically the result is that each man is doing that which is right in his own eyes, even as Israel of old did when there was no king in Israel. I submit, therefore, that it is the duty of the moral and religious leaders of our people to declare with no uncertain sound the fundamental Old Testament principle of the supremacy of law, and to urge upon the hearts and consciences of men that they are not accountable to themselves alone, or to a too yielding and complaisant social order, but that there is a moral purpose in the world, and there is a moral order to which they are under obligation to conform, and that, while they may ignore it for a time and prosper, yet to continue to ignore it is inevitably to precipitate a moral catastrophe. We need to insist upon the Old Testament doctrine of the kingdom of God, which in plain letters means simply the supremacy of God's moral order. So far as the individual and the family are concerned, we must do this much as the Old Testament prophets did it, for the New Testament dispensation has introduced but little change into these departments of human conduct. And while we may feel forced in the light of the teaching of the New Testament to depart from the Old Testament conception of the state as the instrumentality for the realization of the kingdom of God and put the church or the churches of Christ in the place which they assigned to the state, we may still apply the Old Testament principle and demand that both in church and in state the will of God be done, and that his moral government be recognized as the supreme authority.

THE PRESIDENT: The next paper on this topic will be by Rev. Theo. G. Soares, Ph.D., Oak Park, Ill.

THEODORE GERALD SOARES, PH.D., Oak Park, Ill., read the following paper:

“WHAT IS THE ETHICAL VALUE OF THE OLD  
TESTAMENT IN MODERN LIFE?”

Our question may most satisfactorily be answered by a division of the Old Testament into five elements. We have here (1) the records of the national life of the people of Israel, written with a distinctly didactic aim, and therefore involving a moral judgment on the part of the writers; (2) the laws of this people presented with divine sanctions, indicating what were considered practicable ethical standards for the nation; (3) the prophecies, deliverances of the religious teachers, in which are especially the ethical ideals of the Old Testament; (4) the wisdom, embodying the ethical speculations of the philosophers and the practical teachings of the sages; (5) the Psalms, the prayers and praises of Israel, in which the ethical quality of the inner religion of the Old Testament is revealed.

1. We consider first, then, the ethical value of Old Testament narrative in modern life. Putting aside the large amount of genealogy and similar material, which the later priestly writers preserved for their theocratic purpose, and in which there is for the most part no moral quality, there remains that body of narrative—legend, folk-story, hero tradition, historic record—which really constitutes the Old Testament as popularly known. At this point our inquiry becomes most vital: What is the ethical value of the fascinating stories of the Old Testament? It must not be said that these narratives are simply records in which no ethical judgment is involved. They are collated with at least general didactic intent. And the popular instinct which expects moral quality in every Old Testament narrative is to a large extent justified.

It is evident that the foundation of these stories is in that Semitic paganism, of which the Hebrews were a part. We are introduced to a people who practise polygamy, concubinage, slavery, blood revenge, as a matter of course. Adultery is reprehensible in the female, but only in the male as it interferes with property rights of his neighbor. The enslavement of the captives of war, including the compulsory concubinage of the maidens, is the natural order of things. Most barbarous punishment of enemies is chron-

icled without comment. Clemency to enemies is generally considered as an act of weakness, if not of impiety. It must at least be said that no adverse ethical judgment is indicated in the stories of Jacob's clever rascality with Laban; of Judah's shameless act of profligacy; of Rahab's falsehood; of Jael's betrayal of the sacred law of hospitality; of Jephthah's sacrifice of his daughter for his foolish vow; of David's contemplated extirpation of the house of Nabal, his treacherous dealing with his Philistine friends, his dying vengeful counsels to his son; of Elijah's slaughter of the Baal prophets and his fiery destruction of the unfortunate soldiers sent for his arrest; of Jehu's awful bloody revolution; of Ezra's stern divorce of the foreign wives, even though they had borne children to their husbands; and of Mordecai's plan of wholesale slaughter of his people's foes.

In some of these narratives the ethical character of the God of the Old Testament is involved. Israel's bloody wars of extermination, in which, after the manner of that day, no quarter was given even to the women and children, are supposed to have been undertaken with the approval of Jehovah. He receives his share of the spoil of Midian, including a proportion of the virgins, who in this case have been spared after the rest of the captives have been slaughtered in cold blood. Jehu is promised a dynasty of four generations for his massacres. The pathetic murder of the seven sons of Saul seems to be required not only by the Gibeonites, but by the God who will not be satisfied without an atonement of blood. And Jehovah is represented as desirous of punishing Israel, and therefore instigating David to an act of impiety which shall afford the necessary occasion.

In a sense it may be said that there is a negative ethical value in the recognition of this background of paganism. It throws into strong relief those nobler narratives in which a positive ethical value is to be found. The significance of Israel was never in what she shared with the Semitic world, but in her advance upon the morality about her. The presence of pagan survivals in the Old Testament enables us to estimate the ethical advance manifest in the truly great stories which it contains. Such are the Creation narratives, picturing the world fresh from the hands of the good God, filled with calamity only by the sins of men; the story of Abraham and his magnanimity; of Joseph in that old day "wearing the white flower of a stainless life"; of Moses and Joshua



the patriots; even of Samson in the rude stories of the Judges pictured as the slave of sin; of Samuel who left office with clean and empty hands; of Jonathan, the generous; of David, sinner, penitent, and in his troubles kingly; of Elijah, the incarnate conscience; of Ruth, the stranger blest of God, true daughter and true wife; of Jonah, where the vindictive tribal deity becomes the God and Guardian of mankind.

2. We seek the ethical value of the Old Testament secondly, in the laws, which indicate what were considered practicable ethical standards for the nation. And again we find a common Semitic foundation and a superstructure of higher development. The foundation of Hebrew law is that of all law—the sense of right. The morals of a people are their *mores*, the customs which the common conscience approves and requires. The interesting comparison with the Code of Hammurabi shows that there was a great Semitic common law of immemorial usage. And while this testifies to an early sense of right, there is much that indicates a very imperfect ethical development. In Israel, slavery is recognized and regulated. The power conceded to the master is not quite absolute, but he may beat his slave to any point short of immediate death. *Lex talionis* obtains, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, burning for burning. The custom of blood revenge is legalized. The guilt of an accused wife is tested by the primitive ordeal of the water of jealousy. Concubinage is recognized and regulated. Divorce is allowed without question to the man. The child of unlawful birth is excluded from the assembly.

In connection with these older conditions there is to be noted in the legislation a process of amelioration. How carefully such rights as the slave may have are guarded. If the angry master have injured him he must be given his freedom; if the female slave become a concubine she cannot be sold; and, whatever the actual practice may have been, the law contemplated many possibilities of manumission. So, too, the rights of the wife are guarded, although she has not the position which American law accords her. The cities of refuge for the innocent manslayer are a mitigation of that law of blood revenge, which seems ineradicable in the Orient. The ethical value of the legislation is to be seen in these efforts after reform.

The mass of the Hebrew law impresses one with its fine sense of justice. The poor man, the creditor, the wage earner are protected in their rights. Bribery and false witness, the curses of

the East, are singled out for condemnation. More than that, a noble charity is part of the law. The privilege of gleaning, the prohibition of interest, the restoration of the garment taken in pledge, the festal share of the sojourner, the fatherless and the widow, the requirement of liberality to the manumitted slave, even the prohibition of muzzling the treading ox, are indications of the nobler extension of the meaning of the "ought."

The Hebrew law codes bear the marks of the influence of creative minds. The great name Moses stands for a series of men inspired with a sense of right and truth, who from age to age, not as mere codifiers, gathered the old law into statutes and lifted its ethical character a little higher. So we have the Decalogue with its grand imperatives "Thou shalt" and "Thou shalt not." And so we have the great commands of love to God and love to man, which are for our day, as for Jesus' day, the summing up of obligation.

The ethical value, then, of the Old Testament for modern life, so far as its legislation is concerned, is to be seen in the gradual amelioration of the harsh conditions of lower civilization, in the growth of the sense of right, in the realization of the obligation of charity, and in the noble ethical ideals of Israel's great law-givers.

3. The third element to be considered is prophecy. The prophets believe in one God, who is good, and whose demand of men is goodness. The old idea of the tribal God had not much moral force. The religion of the trafficker, who says, "If God will be with me, and will keep me in this way that I go, and will give me bread to eat and raiment to put on . . . then shall Jehovah be my God: and of all that thou shalt give me I will surely give the tenth unto thee," has not much ethical value. But the prophets have a different temper. They may be described as servants of the holy God with a passion for righteousness. Their moral instinct is almost unerring. Their ideals for society are still inspiring.

Consider their insistence upon social righteousness. The Hebrews thought of foreign enemies as their national dangers, and of material wealth as their national glory. They ever looked back to the reign of Solomon, when no foreigner dared invade Israel and when "silver was like stones in Jerusalem" as the time of national well being. The reign of Jeroboam II., when as yet Assyria was afar off, unfear'd, when the national boundaries had been extended, when there were palaces of cedar and couches of ivory, when

agriculture and commerce were flourishing, filled the people with complacency and encouraged them to make their religious ceremonial magnificent. The prophets presented an entirely different idea. Foreign invasion is a merely external calamity. Social injustice is the real national evil. The wealthy state may be only the basket of summer fruit, "the goodly apple rotten at the core." No message can be more thoroughly ethical and more thoroughly modern. The gravest national dangers are the aggregation of wealth in the hands of the few, and monopoly of opportunity that destroys the independent middle class; luxury, depriving the great of their power of leadership and destroying them in self-indulgence; oppression, injustice, taking all hope from the poor, either driving them to rebellion or destroying their usefulness in the state; lying, weakening the tie between man and man; bribery and venality, corrupting the national life at its springs; robbery and murder, attacking the elemental conditions of social order. The prophets believed and preached that the moral reformation of the state would preserve it against all enemies, while no national advance could save a people whose own life was morally corrupt. Each individual nation of the world to-day may take warning from the fate of little Israel and lesser Judah; if it will give attention to the moral diagnosis of national disease so pitilessly presented by the prophets.

On the other hand, the prophets' ethical ideal is exactly our social need at this hour. In our appalling problem of capital and labor, justice is the great desideratum. In all our political endeavors, justice—fair elections, fair legislation, fair administration, fair judicial decision—is the one thing sought. The problem of the negro, of the immigrant, of the Indian, presents the same need. The horror of the tenements, the sad shame of the unemployed, call upon us for the same remedy. The world has never tried what could be done to make the perfect state simply by justice. It is an echo of the fine theory of the prophets when Richelieu says in his vindication to the king:

I found France rent asunder,  
The rich men despots, and the poor banditti;  
Sloth in the mart, and shame within the temple;  
Brawls festering to rebellion; and weak laws.  
Rotting away with rust in antique sheaths.  
I have recreated France. . . . What was my art?  
Genius some say; some, fortune; witchcraft, some.  
Not so;—my art was justice.

Of course there are evils within our state that even social righteousness would not remove. And the prophets saw them in their day. Their demand rings out for personal goodness. Drunkenness and licentiousness, twin deadly dangers, the curse of all classes, are again and again the lament of the prophets. The prophetic ideal is the man of truth and sobriety, strong to stand for the right, willing to die for his convictions, yet humble, simple, kindly. The character of the prophets themselves is a moral inspiration, pure, truthful, fearless, tender, preaching without reward, without popularity, and with a passionate desire to help men. If there is moral value in self-forgetful devotedness to others' welfare, then the prophets, vicarious sufferers for Israel's sins, may still inspire us. Whatever may be our view of that mysterious sufferer in Isaiah 53, there can be no doubt that the devotion of Jeremiah and the prophets formed the basis for the sublime conception.

Our inquiry does not lead us into a study of the religion of the prophets, except to note that it is throughout an ethical religion. Hosea sounds the great prophetic word, "I desire mercy and not sacrifice." Isaiah echoes the same demand, "I can not away with iniquity and the solemn meeting." And Micah expresses the essentially ethical character of religion in that noblest utterance of prophecy, "He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth Jehovah require of thee, but to do justly, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with thy God?"

4. The fourth element which we consider is Wisdom, the writings of the sages. Their most characteristic work, for it represents their activity through the centuries, is the book of Proverbs. The ethical value of the book for modern life is evident from its wholesome effect wherever it has been employed in the instruction of the young. It is not very much a Jewish book. It appeals to the universal conscience. Ruskin's fine tribute to the worth of Proverbs is well known. It has often been said that the stable, if somewhat canny, character of the Scot is in part due to the attention given to this book. The proverb writers find moral motive in the consequences of good and evil conduct. They believe this is a moral world, in which goodness leads to blessedness and evil leads to shame. A good motive, if not the highest, and in large measure

true. Moreover they teach that Wisdom, the right way of life, is to be sought for herself:

She is more precious than rubies:  
And none of the things thou canst desire are to be compared unto her.  
Her ways are ways of pleasantness,  
And all her paths are peace.

When we pass to the body of the Proverbs, their modern ethical value is evident enough, for they combine pithy, pungent sayings with conduct—personal, family, commercial, political, social. And Matthew Arnold has reminded us that conduct is three-fourths of life.

The sages were thinkers, and when men begin to think they find problems, so the wise men of Israel were confronted with the great mysteries of life. They grappled with the age old problem—ever an ethical problem,—Why, under the government of a good God, should a good man suffer? And their noblest piece of literature, the book of Job, is the result of their questioning. Jewish orthodoxy, shutting its eyes to the facts of life, insisted that a good man does not suffer. Job is a moral teacher, because he is true to the facts of experience. It is better to doubt religious opinions than to deny evident realities. It is not moral to deny the moral confusion of the world. Job is a teacher for to-day, as he struggles through his doubt, not to a solution, for there is no answer to ultimate questions, but to a recognition of the infinite power, the personal Jehovah, who holds the mysterious forces of the universe in his hands.

An even deeper question which arose later in the more pessimistic mood of Hebrew wisdom is whether life after all is worth living. If the last verses of Ecclesiastes be really a part of the book, it is easy to take refuge in the position that, after all confusing speculation, there is only one practical wisdom: "Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man." But perhaps the editors of the book felt the need of just such an easy conclusion of the matter, and so furnished it themselves. If that be the case, the ethical contribution of the editors is more apparent than that of the book itself. Ecclesiastes comes from a man whose way is dark. He has neither the vision of the prophets nor the general philosophy of Providence that characterizes the sages. He does believe there is good in the world, and he

does strive after it. But we miss the passion, hope, faith, that we desire in our sacred books. Were this bit of speculation representative of the wisdom of the wise, we should not often turn to them for moral encouragement.

If we are to include in Wisdom the exquisite little poem, "The Song of Songs," we have another ethical message for modern life. It teaches our wealth-admiring age that marriage love is the real happiness of life:

If a man would give all the substance of his house for love,  
It would utterly be contemned.

5. There remains to consider the ethical value of the Psalms, the lyric prayers and praises of Israel. It is significant that the editors of the Psalter have put an ethical lyric at the head of the collection. The religion of the Psalmists is throughout not ceremonial but ethical. Psalms 15 and 24 describe for all time God's demands of the true worshipper, "Clean hands and a pure heart." Every man who thinks that he can separate between religion and life should hear the word of the ancient prayer, "If I regard iniquity in my heart, the Lord will not hear me." Many psalms are quite in the spirit of the Wisdom literature, and are really didactic poems,

Depart from evil, and do good;  
Seek peace, and pursue it.

The sense of sin in the psalmists is not ceremonial, but ethical,

Thou delightest not in sacrifice; else would I give it.  
The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit.

The penitential lyrics are surely of ethical value for modern life.

But a marked characteristic of the Psalms which seems to mar their value for to-day is the recurring reference to "the enemy." It is of course important to recognize that in very few instances are these private enemies. The psalmists pray for victory over enemies of war; they cry to God for deliverance from the foreign conquerors and tyrants, whom they knew so often through their tragic history; they are filled with a righteous anger against oppressors of the poor and weak within the state; or they are

indignant with apostate Jews who seek to lead others from the faith. The fundamental idea in these "enemy" psalms is a true one, and its recognition has great moral value. It is the prophet's passion for righteousness and the wise man's belief in retribution, both translated into prayer. But it cannot be denied that the spirit of ancient vengeance often breathes through these ardent poems. The savagery of the warfare of those days is in Psalm 137. The horrible inclusion of wife and children in a man's punishment appears in the awful imprecations of Psalm 109. Jesus has taught us better. He has taught us to hate iniquity and to withstand it, and yet be tender toward the misguided man who is guilty of it. Some of the "enemy" psalms we cannot use. Many of them may well express our horror of the sins and wrongs of the world and our prayer to God that right may conquer.

The Old Testament is not the New Testament. And we have only one Teacher. But the Old Testament has ethical value for us still. It shows to us characters and deeds of moral power; it has commands of abiding validity; it presents ideals of righteousness that the world has not yet learned; it has practical precepts that may teach us wisdom; it has songs and prayers that make us better men.

THE PRESIDENT: The first appointed speaker on this subject is Prof. J. R. Sampey, D.D., of Louisville, Ky.

JOHN R. SAMPEY, D.D.:

(The stenographer's report of this address was so imperfect that it did not assist the speaker in recalling a single sentence as delivered. The speaker has given an abstract of the address, as he did not deem it fair to his three colleagues in the discussion to insert an essay or a speech that was not actually delivered.)

We seem to be at one in our estimate of three sections of the Old Testament; all admire the ethical teachings of the prophets, the ideals of the sages of Israel, and the deep religious and ethical experiences of the psalmists. As to the imprecatory psalms, there might be some difference of opinion. We do not forget that the psalmists lived before our Lord Jesus taught, by precept and example, love to enemies, and we would not think of judging them by the standards of a later time. Recent experiences in the municipal election in my own city of Louisville have taught me that a good man can call upon God to damn graft in all its forms, while at the same

time, as a Christian, asking God to open the eyes of the grafters and turn them from their evil ways. The twentieth century needs to cherish wholesome hatred of violence and fraud and injustice after the fashion of the ancient psalmists.

As to the early stories in the Bible, and as to the legislation in the Pentateuch, there are evidently differences of opinion on this platform. Some of the stories in Genesis and the other historical books are praised for their ethical beauty, while others are thought by some to be unworthy of a place in the Bible. I believe that the blackest stories of impurity and crime were inserted for the purpose of warning men from similar sins. Moreover, the twentieth century needs to know what God thinks of certain sins that polite society refuses to discuss, but too often practises. Men who read novels in which the author delights to skate on thin ice in his suggestion of things improper will sometimes affect to despise the Bible for picturing some of the grossest sins in their hideous nakedness. You would not have to go four squares from some of your palatial homes in Cincinnati to find scores of men and women, boys and girls, who would be helped by a study of the sections of the Pentateuch that plead for common decency. The Bible is a book for all the world, and those who have reached a point at which such precepts offend their taste ought to remember that others may be greatly profited by the reading of such elementary laws and counsels.

The doctrine of a *progressive* revelation has helped me in my effort to understand the Bible as a whole. God speaks in the Old Testament in many parts and in many ways, but in it all God is the chief speaker. He is educating Israel and the world to receive a perfect revelation in the person of his Son. The Old Testament slopes upward to Christ. All the teachings through the prophets, whether in story or legislation or sermon or poem, have immense ethical value for all time—modern as well as ancient. Such teaching is not on the same plane as that of the Son of God, who spoke as never man spake, but it is instructive and stimulating to men of all ages. Modern men ought to know the Old Testament. They will be better Christians if they study the Bible from lid to lid. Nor will they misunderstand the sacred writers when they describe wrong deeds without pausing to read a moral lecture. The study of the Old Testament will prepare men for a better appreciation of the perfect ethical life and perfect ethical teachings of the Saviour of mankind. The progressive revelation begun in the Old Testament



finds finality in the New, and the earlier fragmentary and varied teachings ought never to be wholly divorced from the life and teaching of our Lord.

THE PRESIDENT: The next appointed speaker is the Rev. Rufus W. Weaver, Ph.D., of Baltimore, Maryland.

REV. RUFUS W. WEAVER: *Mr. President and Brethren:* It is with some trepidation that I follow the distinguished gentlemen who have preceded me in this discussion. They are incumbents of professorial chairs in three of our foremost institutions of learning: Rochester Theological Seminary, Chicago University, and the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. They are scholars, and I am but an humble pastor engaged in preaching to people who are now alive. It is not surprising that, from my viewpoint, these gentlemen have laid too great an emphasis upon the first part of our subject and too little upon the last part. They have discussed in a masterly way the ethical value of the Old Testament, but have not given, so it seems to me, sufficient emphasis to making effective its ethical value in modern life. Professor Betteridge finds the philosophical basis for all ethics in the Old Testament. Professor Soares discovers in his superb critical study an ethical evolution, and Professor Sampey, at whose feet it was my rich delight to sit during the three years of my theological training, has given a noble defense of the more conservative view of the Old Testament. Using the Old Testament constantly in pulpit ministrations, my interest centers in the application of its ethical teachings to modern life.

The truest and fullest revelations of men appear in their appreciations and their temptations. The most interesting of all personalities is Jesus of Nazareth. His word is the final word in religion and morals. The relation of Jesus to the Old Testament was that of an interpreter. He was an exegete, an expositor, and in the best sense of the word, a critic. He brought forth from its treasures things new and old.

His estimate of its ethical value appears in his applications and his temptations. As Jesus looked upon the young ruler, whose ethical development was the result of study and obedience to the Law, he loved the young ruler, and this look of love had its source in the Master's appreciation of the ethical value of the Old Testa-

ment. In the recesses of the Master's mind, where reside those appreciations—those judgment-values—that make for culture and for character, there lay, ever potentially responsive, His estimate of the Law as a character-producing agency, which, awakened by the replies of the young ruler, sent forth involuntarily that effulgence of affection which the disciples saw in the face of the Master. When the mind of the Master was swaying between two opposing courses of action, the ethical teaching of the Law which He learned at Nazareth guided and strengthened Him to resist the evil. In each successive trial, He quotes and interprets the Law to the defeat of the Tempter. The involuntary approval of the Law which lighted the face of the Master as He gazed upon the rich young ruler, and the deliberate choice of the commands and the arguments of the Law in the fierce conflict of His temptation affirm beyond all question and for all time the supreme ethical value of the Old Testament, at least for all who honor Him as Lord.

We often hear it said that man to-day looks out upon a new heaven and a new earth. We mean man has a new perspective of heaven and earth—a new appreciation of glories whose revelation long waited man's powers to apperceive them. A no less remarkable change has come in man's perspective of his Bible, and, in very truth, to-day man holds in his hands not only a revised but a *new* Bible. Man's perspective of the Bible has ever determined the method of his interpretation. The allegorical method is symbolic Bible study under the guidance of the imagination; the dogmatic method is deductive Bible study under the guidance of *a priori* assumptions—fiats of the will. The historical method is empirical Bible study under the guidance of the intellect. The peril of the allegorical method is fanciful and unwarranted interpretations; the peril of the dogmatic method is arbitrary and fallacious interpretations; the peril of the historical method is critical and despiritualized interpretations. To-day the historical method of interpretation is in the ascendancy. Higher criticism is one of its products. The doctrine of evolution has been applied confidently to the Old Testament writings, and the higher critics have proven to their own satisfaction the multiple authorship of the Hexateuch, the priority of the prophets over the Law, and the progressive religious movement from

polytheism to ethical monotheism. Certainly the mechanical theory of verbal inspiration has been overthrown. The unmoral amanuensis, writing according to divine dictation—a human typewriter played upon by the fingers of God—has disappeared, and in its stead there stands, heroic and human, the prophet whose ear Jehovah had unbarred. Reluctantly there has been restored to the prophet his ethical rights and obligations. There is now recognized a variation in the values of the books of the Old Testament. They no longer stand upon a parity, but in the order of progressive revelation and intrinsic worth. Because of this fact the Bible needs interpreters and interpretations. Had the Bible been the book often conceived by theologians, its proper use would be limited to its perusal, and preachers would be simply public readers, not expositors and interpreters. Mrs. Eddy is logically consistent, believing in the infallible inspiration of "Science and Health," in demanding that preachers of Christian Science shall be simply "readers." The new perspective calls for more modesty, more study, and more prayer, a deeper spiritual insight, a warmer appreciation of all moral and spiritual values and, above all else, the culture of the consciousness of Christ. The new perspective of the Bible presents to us the record of God's revelations of Himself, limited by man's capacity to receive, and of man's gropings after God, limited by the finity of man's spiritual reach.

The supreme need of our age is an ethical revival. Great ethical movements in the Biblical period always began with a call to repentance. The prophet, whether Hebrew or Christian, had an ethical ideal which he saw the people of his age did not realize. The right to call men to repentance is one of the highest of spiritual achievements. It carries with it that he who makes the call has an ethical ideal, an ethical faith, an ethical experience far superior to those about him. To command men to repent is not a phonographic message transmitted to us from God, but it is the product of the divine and the human. The preacher who has a horror of sin, an unspeakable disgust for everything impure, a revulsion in the presence of temptations that fascinate those about him, is the only preacher who with power can call men to repentance. Savonara, John Knox, John Wesley changed the ages in which they lived, because in their heart of hearts there was the sublime appreciation of holiness and the unspeakable horror of unholiness. These men were scholars, but they used their scholarship for spiritual ends.

The unregenerated scholar, though he sits in the professorial chair of a German university, is the poorest of interpreters. The unlettered saint is a safer guide than he. But he who weds the ripest scholarship and the most reverent faith in the interest of the moral elevation of his age is the safest and best of interpreters.

The ethical value of the Old Testament in modern life depends upon modern interpretations. A literature to be effective must be appreciated, be studied, be interpreted, and be popularly understood. For nearly a century Shakespeare was forgotten; then rediscovered, appreciated, studied, interpreted, and restored to higher honor than ever before in the literary world. The Old Testament to be effective in modern life must be rediscovered, appreciated, studied, and interpreted by the religious thinkers of the age in harmony with the values of Jesus.

The crux of this problem is the interpreter. The Old Testament Scriptures which strengthened the Master in his temptations, of whose lasting quality He said heaven and earth shall first pass away, afford a sufficient ethical standard. The age needs to be ethically revived, and the age knows its need. New moral conditions in business, in society, in politics are arising, multitudinous in number and perplexing beyond compare. The age needs not to be merely revived, but to be taught the new duties which its new occasions demand. In the ministry there is a lack of conviction, a lack of moral earnestness, a lack of spiritual energy—few voices with enthusiasm! Few prophets thundering, "Jehovah hath spoken"! Few pulpits, thrones of power! The consciousness of the Hebrew prophet, with his sense of a living message from God, with his note of compelling authority, with his disdain of the things for which men were seeking then, does not appear to a marked degree in the ministry of to-day.

The modern ministry falls into three groups: (1) Those who are hospitable to new truth, and who give their spare time to studies that grow out of the modern inductive method. (2) Those who hold tenaciously to the old views, and who give their spare time to further fortifying their positions. (3) Those who are in a state of suspended judgment, whose expressions depend largely upon the company they are in, and who feel that in their pulpit administrations they must say nothing that will shake the faith of those they instruct. The modern ministry is composed of the pathfinders, the creed-defenders, and the phrase-makers. No doubt George A. Gor-

don is right in saying that "Not since the beginning of preaching has there been any time so hard upon the educated and honest minister."

The Christian ministry faces the world as Browning describes David facing the despondent Saul. For the world, regnant in the world of things, rich in every form of wealth, save that which is spiritual, is half-crazed. A fever of unrest, of bitterness, not to say despair, is quickening and exhausting its energies. What message must we bear to the world in order to make most effective the ethical value of the Old Testament? Hear, O Israel! We are called to be Christ-men, cultivating the consciousness of Christ, the assuming toward our fellow men the attitude of Christ. Truly there is needed to-day a new apologetic, and it must be written in deeds by men who have incarnated the spirit of the Hebrew prophets. Our present weakness is not heresy of doctrine, but heresy of conduct; not the rejection of the atonement in our creeds, but the rejection of the cross in our lives. The quickening of the American conscience is possible only as we assume toward the Old Testament the attitude of Jesus and enthrone in our minds His appreciations of the Hebrew Scripture. Then with intrepid spirit we may proclaim the lofty, uncompromising ethical teachings of the Old Testament, speaking like our Master with the note of authority.

As we become Christ-men, our hearts thrilling with a passion for holiness, our faces glowing with divine enthusiasm, our minds exulting in our heaven-born mission, our hands toiling in loving ministries for our fellow men, our feet climbing new Calvaries of sacrificial love, we will surely possess the power of rightly interpreting the Old Testament, and through the preaching of its ethical truths lead men to acknowledge the need of the Saviour. Then in our own hearts we will realize the joy of David when he cried:

"O Saul, it shall be

A face like my face that receives me, a Man like me

Thou shalt love and be loved forever; a Hand like this hand

Shall throw open the gates of new life to thee.

See the Christ stand."

THE PRESIDENT: There are no cards indicating that a further discussion of this subject is desired, and Rev. Frank G. McFarlan, Ph.D., will offer a closing prayer.

The session was closed with prayer by Rev. Dr. Frank G. McFarlan.

## FIRST DAY.

*Evening Session.*

Tuesday, November 14, 1905.

8 P. M.

---

THE PRESIDENT: Let us open the evening session by singing Hymn No. 522, "I Love Thy Kingdom, Lord."

The opening prayer was offered by Rev. Mr. Stevens, Middletown, O.

THE PRESIDENT: We will now proceed to the discussion of the subject, "What is the Source of Authority in Protestantism?" The first writer is Prof. M. G. Evans, D.D., of Chester, Pa.

PROFESSOR MILTON G. EVANS, D.D., of Crozer Theological Seminary, presented the following paper:

## AUTHORITY IN PROTESTANTISM.

The supernatural is authoritative for man. It matters not how the revelation is disclosed, whether through rustling leaves, or flying birds, or wind-driven clouds, or entrails of sacrificial animals, or Delphian oracle, or Cumæan sibyl, or lot, or dream, or vision, or miracle, or prophetic word, it is conceived to be imperative. The problem for the worshiper is not to prove his obligation, but to convince himself that his god has spoken. Inevitably, the worshiper's conduct is fashioned by the content of revelation, and his character the reflex of the conceived character of deity. His highest welfare then demands that the revealed will be an adequate expression of the character of the one true God. "This is the life eternal, that they know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou didst send." Hence, the whole religious history of the Hebrews from Abraham to Christ had no other aim than the self-disclosure of Jehovah and the training of his people to distinguish between his revelation and the mutterings of enchanter and sorcerers. The discipline in-

volved the elimination of crude means of ascertaining divine guidance and the acceptance of personality as sole interpreter of a personal God. Accordingly, in Israelitish history prophets denounced sorcery and magic, discarded the use of omen and lot, and claimed themselves to be direct bearers of revelation. But as prophets condemned inherited beliefs and antagonized accepted usage, their message was expected to be divinely attested, if it were to be received as authoritative. Theoretically the people regarded miracles of knowledge and of power as adequate credentials of a divine messenger, but practically neither of these availed to distinguish the true prophet from the false. The true prophet depended on the content of his doctrine, and in this he sharply distinguished himself from seers and diviners. "But as for me, I am full of power by the Spirit of Jehovah, and of judgment, and of might, to declare unto Jacob his transgression, and to Israel his sin," says Micah, contrasting himself with his contemporary prophets. That is, appeal was taken from the sphere of intellectual assent, secured by marvellous and strange signs, to the sphere of moral judgment, which detected moral and religious implications of the prophet's words. If hearers valued morally uplifting instruction, they pronounced those prophets false that gave degrading views of Jehovah and low standards of righteousness; if, on the contrary, they preferred licentiousness to purity, drunkenness to sobriety, worship of Astarte to worship of Jehovah, they accepted the authority of prophets that ministered to passion. "If a man walking in wind and falsehood do lie, saying, I will prophesy unto thee of wine and strong drink; he shall even be the prophet of this people," charges Micah; and Jeremiah cries, "A wonderful and horrible thing is come to pass in the land: the prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests bear rule by their means; and my people love to have it so." Hearers, then, had to employ critical processes to distinguish between revelations; but criticism implies an accepted standard of judgment. Such a standard in Israel was Jehovah's revelation of himself in history. The deliverance from Egypt was both a fact and doctrine, and on this initial act of revelation was based the moral and religious requirements of the Ten Words. "I am Jehovah thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have no other gods before me, etc." This fundamental revelation, mediated by Moses, became Israel's 'categorical imperative.' No subsequent revelations, even though attested by miracle, an-

nulled its demands. To its authority priest, prophet, king and people must submit. Subsequent disclosures of Jehovah's will could partake of the nature of modifications, amplifications and interpretations of the primal disclosure, but they must not invalidate its authority. On this basis each religious teacher professing to speak in Jehovah's name ran the gauntlet of contemporary criticism, with the possibility that the true prophet would be rejected, and false teaching accepted. History alone vindicated the true. The critical process applied to every prophet by his contemporaries was applied by post-exilic Jews to the whole line of religious teachers from Moses to Malachi, with the result that they found in their consistency of doctrine, in their moral and religious elevation, in the permanency of their teaching, in the fulfilment of their predictions, and in the wondrous special providences ministering to their welfare, an attestation of their uniform claim to be divinely commissioned. The theoretical authority was Jehovah, the giver of revelation; the practical authority was the attested messenger, the mediator of revelation.

But the facts of history have not yet been fully stated. For the practical authority for Judaism was not Moses and the prophets, but the books of Moses and of the prophets. The critical process was more complicated. For if the citizens of Jerusalem in Josiah's time had to use judgment to determine whether Jeremiah or Hananiah were the true prophet, much more had the Jews of Herod's day to use critical methods to determine whether the book of Jeremiah which they were reading were as authoritative as his message spoken centuries before. They could answer affirmatively only on condition that they were sure that the word written was a substantially accurate reproduction of the word spoken. This involved purely historical investigation of the origin and preservation of the text. This had been done to the satisfaction of the Jews of Christ's day. Their actual authority was a group of books called the Holy Scriptures. They did not in practice distinguish between God the giver of revelation, the prophet the mediator of revelation to his own generation, and the book the mediator of prophetic revelation to later generations. The book was as authoritative as Jehovah. Jewish scribes so accepted it; Jesus so accepted it.

The end of the process is not yet, however. The book had to be interpreted. The interpretation must be accepted as evident demand of God before it could be received as authoritative. How is the



interpreter to prove his claim to be revealing the divine will? As already stated, both scribe and Jesus accepted the same written authority, but each interpreted it so as to win the hostility of the other. Each tried to win a following, and appealed to their common standard in support of their teaching. Hearers brought critical tests, and decided that Jesus was the more authoritative expositor. "And it came to pass, when Jesus ended these words, the multitudes were astonished at his teaching. For he was teaching them as having authority, and not as their scribes." But the question remained, What right has the son of Mary to claim to be God's authorized interpreter? By what right does the carpenter's son presume to pass judgment on the value of the law as a revelation? Can he accept Moses as authority, when he declares that the Mosaic enactment concerning divorce does not represent the divine will? Can he think himself amenable to Levitical law, when he insists that "there is nothing from without the man, that going into him, can defile him"? Can he accept the Old Testament as regulative of his conduct, when he claims that he himself is more authoritative than Moses, greater than the temple, and Lord of the Sabbath? In view of his words and deeds, how can he consistently say, "Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets; I came not to destroy, but to fulfil."

In the nature of the case, he had to vindicate himself to his contemporaries; and he did so by appeal to miracles. But in his case, as in the theoretical instances in the Old Testament, miracles did not conclusively prove his claims. Nicodemus indeed said, "Rabbi, we know that thou hast come from God as teacher, for no one can do these signs which thou art doing except God be with him"; but the scribes said, "He has Beelzebub, and through the prince of demons he casts out the demons." In fact, multitudes acknowledged his miracle-working power and also admitted the singular force of his teaching, yet were not sure of their origin. They exercised critical powers and reached varying conclusions. Jesus the son of Mary had to wait for history to prove him Son of God also. After the resurrection and after Pentecost the earliest Christians saw that the deeds and words and character of Jesus of Nazareth were so congruous as to demonstrate that he had been divinely commissioned. From that time he became their authority. To be sure, they still accepted the Old Testament, but it was the Old Testament interpreted by him. The new interpretation had the force of a new

revelation. In theory, then, both Jew and Christian accepted the Jewish canon, but it meant a very different thing to each. The divergence was not due solely to the spirit and method of the interpreter, but also to the fact that the canon circulated in two versions whose readings differed. The practical issue was that the accepted authority was neither the Hebrew nor Greek text, but the best interpreters. Great teachers, by their character, their mental acumen, their manifest knowledge of facts, mastered their followers. Scholarship was the actual authority, whatever the theoretical standard may have been; and the zeal with which it was attempted to make the theoretical conform to the actual is attested by the labors of Aquila, Theodotion, Symmachus, Origen, Eusebius, Pamphilus, Lucian and Hesychius. The history of the accepted authority within the Christian Church is an exact duplicate of that within Judaism. Throughout the process of formation of the New Testament canon history and the critical judgment were the courts of appeal. Even Augustine, living at the close of the process, made history the final arbiter, although he knew that it rendered a halting decision. His words are: ". . . there is a distinct boundary line separating all productions subsequent to apostolic times from the authoritative canonical books of the Old and New Testaments. The authority of these books has come down to us from the apostles through the succession of bishops and the extension of the church," He writes further, "Where will you find any authority, if not in the gospel and apostolic writings? How can you be sure of the authorship of any book, if we doubt the apostolic origin of those books which are attributed to the apostles by the church which the apostles themselves founded, and which occupies so prominent a place in all lands, and if at the same time we acknowledge as the undoubted production of the apostles what is brought forward by heretics in opposition to the church, whose authors, from whom they derive their name, lived long after the apostles?"

From these passages it seems clear that when Augustine declared, "I would not believe the gospel unless the authority of the church moved me thereto," he used the word church in the sense of a continuous body of believers competent to testify to facts, not in the sense of an institution having a right to teach revelation with divine authority. That which moved the Bishop of Hippo moves every Protestant.

From the fourth century the authority of an organized ecclesiastical machine gained increasing ascendancy over the authority of ecclesiastical tradition; indeed, the machine made its own history, to which it afterwards appealed to confirm its claims. History, however, has a way of asserting its rights. Just when the organized church, speaking through Pope Eugenius, decreed the extent of the New Testament canon, literature from the early Christian centuries rose from the grave and gave its testimony. It testified of the doubts concerning canonical validity of certain books; Erasmus, heeding their witness, also doubted. The Sorbonne decided, "It is no longer right for a Christian to doubt concerning these," *i. e.*, concerning books sanctioned by usage and by the judgment of the church. In the sixteenth century a formal vote of a theological faculty decreed that to be a sin which was not considered such in the second. It was this sort of authority that the Reformers rejected. It was the church as conceived by the Council of Trent, not the church as conceived by the Third Council of Carthage, against which Luther protested.

The two parties in the controversy had now to define their authority. Both admitted revelation to be authority; they differed in belief as to the method by which it was mediated. Each wished a practical standard of judgment to which final appeal could be made. The church held its authority to be, first, Scripture, including the Apocrypha; second, the words of Christ handed down by oral tradition through the Apostles; third, teaching of the Apostles orally transmitted through the church. Consistently with its emphasis on the unity of the church, it held that since freedom of interpretation involved doctrinal differences, there must be an infallible interpreter of the meaning of Scripture and tradition. Such infallible interpretation is given by those ancient fathers whose teachings have been approved by the church, and by the Pope, and by a general council. That is, the Catholic Church practically acted on the theory that God was repeating in the Holy Roman Church what he had done in Israel; that as Moses and prophetic interpretations of Moses and historical narratives illustrating Israel's relation to the law came to be canonical for later Jewish community, so Jesus and ecclesiastical interpretations of Jesus' words and ecclesiastical narratives illustrating relation of preceding generations to the Catholic standard should regulate the faith of Christian Europe in the sixteenth and all subsequent centuries. This theory

would have been acceptable if Christian people could have received the popes and the canonized saints as occupying the same relative place in the Christian history that kings and prophets occupied in Israel. But just at this point was the difference. Later Jews looked back and saw unmistakable evidences that prophets had been among them and that their history had been divinely controlled; later European Christians, the Waldensians, the Hussites, the followers of Wycliffe, the adherents of Luther, of Zwingli, and of Calvin, looked back over Christian history, and could not recognize in Origen, Jerome, Augustine, or in popes, or in councils, the authorized spokesmen for Christ. Here, again, Protestants critically examined authority on the basis of history, and rejected every medium of revelation except Scripture; and on the grounds of newly discovered evidence contracted their Scriptural authority by eliminating the Old Testament Apocrypha. They did not admit that a council by vote is able to determine a fact in history, a phenomenon in nature, or a truth in metaphysics; but they did accept the testimony of the church in so far as it by historical continuity brought forth facts and truths out of the past. Whether the fact or truth was accepted as authority in conduct and creed depended on its nature. Accordingly, Luther attached great importance to the consensus of the entire Christian Church. On this ground he justified the practice of infant baptism; on this ground, too, he was conservative in changing existing forms of worship. His general principle was that anything is lawful which is not expressly condemned by Scripture. This allowed wide range for the use of critical powers; and Luther did not hesitate to claim the right. When the Elector of Brandenburg asked him whether it were true that he had said that he would not stop unless convinced from Scripture, he replied, "Yes, my lord, unless I am convinced by clear and evident reasons." Theoretically this answer implies that clear and evident reasons might possibly have induced the reformer to doubt the authority of Scriptures. He admitted the implication, but considered himself loyal to his authority by defining its extent, and interpreting its meaning. In effect, he got certain fundamental Christian truths out of some of the New Testament books, and then used these truths as standard by which to judge the remaining books. In this way he summarily disposed of John's Apocalypse, "My spirit cannot accommodate itself to the book: the reason being that I do not think Christ is taught therein;" and also depreciated the letter of James, "I cannot,

then, place it among the chief books." But he knew that his test was subjective, and therefore not necessarily binding upon others. Of James' letter he writes, "I will forbid no one to place and elevate it as he pleases"; and of the Apocalypse he says, "No man ought to be hindered from holding it to be a work of St. John or otherwise, as he will."

The historical fact is that it was not the New Testament conceived as a definite collection of books that was authority for the Reformers, but the New Testament interpreted by men of lofty spiritual aspirations, using the best scholarship available. The fact that Protestants demanded the best Greek text possible, while Catholics assigned divine authority to the Latin Vulgate, was predictive of the value Protestantism would, with ever increasing insistency, place upon scholarship. The existence of Lutheran, Reformed, Arminian, Cocceian, Pietistic, Rationalistic, and Syncretistic schools of exegesis, with the numerous adherents of each, shows that in fact the authority for Protestants has been an interpretation of the words of the New Testament, rather than the words themselves. True, this variety of interpretation is a standing jest to Catholics, but a true reformer will not have it otherwise. There is something better in personal history than consistency of conduct; there is something more valuable in society than uniformity of thought. The only place where men think alike is the place where they do not think at all—the graveyard.

This rapid review of the nature of a written record as authority for human conduct and of its practical working in human history compels the conclusion that authority in Protestantism is the Bible accurately interpreted. But accuracy is a relative term. Accurate knowledge in chemistry a decade ago is now inaccurate; an authority in the theory and practice of medicine a generation ago is now repudiated; methods of interpretation employed in all universities a century ago have been modified. In all departments of knowledge scholars whose names were once a synonym for master are now conceived to have been doing menial service for greater ones that followed. More light has shone out from all God's works, whether in external nature, the moral and mental constitution of man, or the social constitution of the race, as well as from the Bible. The competent interpreter gathers up the light from all these sources and focuses it upon human duties. In this constant process from generation to generation the perpetual marvel is that the New Testa-

ment seems to speak to each generation as if it were designed to speak to it alone, while the aids to interpretation become obsolete. The two permanent factors are the Bible and the interpreter; and the Bible speaks authoritatively in proportion to the competency of the interpreter. Competency is ability to commend oneself to every man's conscience in the sight of God. This is much more than possession of a spirit akin to the spirit that breathes out of the word of God; it is this plus every mental endowment, cultivated to the highest degree possible, with which God has equipped his spokesman. No man has a right to claim to speak with authority, unless he has authority; and his authority to interpret the Bible must rest on possession of sufficient knowledge of related facts. In exegesis, as in every other science, expert knowledge must be the ultimate test. Within Protestantism such expertness has shown the invalidity of the Catholic standard; is demonstrating the transitoriness of creeds based on defective interpretation; and is heralding the dawn of that day when Protestant Christendom will not tolerate appeal to a common standard in support of theological differences.

And Baptists have contributed their share to this end. By purely linguistic and historical investigation, they have demonstrated submersion to have been the New Testament mode of baptism; they have shown the New Testament simplicity of the Lord's supper; and, with the aid of other scholars, they have established the fact of the congregational form of church government in apostolic times. These assured results have been secured through scholarship alone; and the deliverances of our authority, mediated through competent interpreters, are accepted as final. Protestants wish no other guide than a correctly interpreted Bible; Baptists have won their victories through it; and the way to other victories of every sort is by the same path. When every power of mind and heart is engaged in finding out what our Master Christ means when he speaks through the New Testament, men will no longer raise the false antithesis between religions of authority and religions of the spirit. For Christians in this workaday world the Spirit mediates his authority through means that appeal to the human spirit, and the human spirit in proportion to its enlightenment detects the tone of authority in the mediating agent. Ultimately Christian scholarship will still the babel of voices, and give with assurance the meaning of the Bible, which will then be acknowledged to be the very word of the

God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is alone worthy to be authority for men.

THE PRESIDENT: The next writer on this subject is Rev. Dr. James Loring Cheney, of Cleveland, O.

JAMES L. CHENEY, D.D., then read as follows:

## THE SOURCE OF AUTHORITY IN PROTESTANTISM.

### A. *The Bible.*

To the question "What is the source of authority?" a quick reply, generally, may be expected. There jumps to the tongue, Chillingworth's well-known formula, widely popular for three hundred years, "The Bible, the whole Bible and nothing but the Bible, is the religion of Protestants."

With a sharp stroke this has cut away the precept and practice of the papacy, whose rule has been not the "*Bible alone*," but the "*Bible and tradition*." In theory the papacy has held these two as co-ordinate; in practice all has been subordinate to tradition.

When correctly used, Chillingworth's formula settles many, yes most, of the great problems of authority.

A heathen came to Chrysostom. "I desire to be a Christian, but in the divisions and confusions among you all, what shall I believe?" Chrysostom answers, "If we send you to the Scriptures, and they are simple and true, your decision is easy: *for whosoever accords with them, he is a Christian*; but whoever is at variance with them, is very far from it."

How great a blessing the widespread circulation of our Bible has brought to our age! When few Bibles could be had, little wonder that few Protestants could be found.

In a Baptist assemblage, no time is needed in vindication of our reliance upon God's word as the only and infallible guide of faith and practice. The best Tindale Bible belongs to our Bristol College. Baptists have been among the leaders in Bible translations and Bible societies, as well as in Sunday schools and mission effort.

"What saith the Scripture?" Who would surrender that ever important test?

"God's word declares it, it is written, it is therefore true." Who would deny this general proposition?

Still, the Protestant is somewhat belated who has not heard the voice of honest inquiry. It is no less distinct now than in the days of Chrysostom. In using the Scriptures, what are the ultimate facts as to the MSS.? Which MSS. shall I follow? and how discriminate between LXX and Vulgate?

Shall I hold in the same rank the Epistle to the Romans and the Epistle of James? In the very Gospels, dare I make any distinction between the words of Jesus and the editorial comments of the Evangelists? An infallible Pope can declare for verbal inspiration, as to every word in sixty-six books, but what about the Apocrypha? If I accept verbal inspiration, does that bring the utterance of Satan in Job up to the same level with the words of the Saviour in John 14? and are the twilight saints clearly as reliable as the spirit-filled apostles? Back of all these matters of detail, it remains a fact that the Gospel was preached before it was documented. Furthermore, what did our Lord mean in John 16: 12-14? And still further, "Which, in a word, is the source? Is it the Book? or is it the Author of the Book?"

### B. *The Church.*

"Pillar and Ground of Truth." What can be more clear? Has the Church given us the Canon? Surely the Church has a place all its own.

The Church is the Body, Christ is the Head.

Christians are the Branches, Christ is the Living Vine.

The Church is the Flock, Christ the Shepherd.

"Christ loved the Church and gave Himself for it."

Can Protestants endorse the dogma, "The Church is the only 'Ark' in which salvation from the flood of destruction is possible"?

Yet Harnack has quoted recently what Carlyle wrote two generations ago: 'In these distracted times, when the religious principle, driven out of most churches, either lies unseen in the hearts of good men, looking and longing and silently working there, towards some new revelation; or else wanders homeless over the world, like a disembodied soul, seeking its terrestrial organization—into how many *strange shapes of superstition and fanaticism does it not tentatively and errantly cast itself!* The higher enthusiasm of man's nature is for the while without employment, yet does it continue indestructible, unweariedly active, and work blindly in the



great chaotic deep; thus seat after seat, and church after church, bodies itself forth and melts again into a new metamorphosis."

Yes, men crave something fixed, an infallible guide. How many devices are attempted to unload responsibility: the casting of the lot, the flip of a coin. Back in Pompeii the oracle's shrine was shrewdly arranged with a hole for the priest to put in his head, so as to utter oracular wisdom, as occasion and cash demanded.

In the time of Ignatius, infallibility, the organ of truth, resided in the parochial bishop; in the time of Cyprian, in the entire episcopal body, Gerson and the Fathers of Basel and Constance found it in the Council; they of the Vatican found it in the person of the Pope.

Shall we recall Father Hecker's dictum, "The first and deepest want of man's heart is guidance, but it must be an unerring and divine guidance. Nothing less than this can give repose to man's feelings and the sense of security in his intelligence. Such a guidance, alone, can give to man happiness, and ennoble his being while he obeys."

Said Cardinal Newman, "I have been (since becoming a Catholic) in perfect peace and contentment. It was like coming into port after a rough sea, and my happiness on that score remains to this day without interruption."

In Harnack's widely circulated lectures on the subject of Protestantism, he writes: "To use the language of commerce, the old Protestant House is still certainly a going concern, but in the course of history, as we know, houses have a way of degenerating." "The Protestantism of to-day is fast becoming a duplicate of the papacy." The catholicizing of Protestants alarms the learned German."

Read his lament as to European churches: "Added to this Catholic conception of the Church, which identifies the Church of the Faith with the Church of History, we evangelicals are also gradually experiencing everything that naturally goes with it—fanaticism, the despotic tendency, impatience, a mania for persecution, clerical uniform and clerical police."

Among American ecclesiastics, who does not fail to observe this centralizing tendency? Is the voice of the majority always the voice of God?

Surely the Church has its place, but there are limitations.

Sabatier calls attention to the fact that "Ekklesia" occurs only twice on the lips of Jesus, and is found only in one Gospel, and in

that belongs to the last revision, edited many decades after the death of Jesus.

What a development has occurred, when Cardinal Manning can speak in the name of the Pope: "I am the last Supreme Judge of what is right and wrong." No wonder the awful thunder-storm brought terror when the Council of 1870 decreed the Pope's infallibility.

That the Papal church has gone beyond the limits, even a Pope has confessed; the learned and enlightened Benedict XIV doubted, and made light of, infallibility. "If it is true," said he, "that in the treasure house of my breast are hidden all law and truth, I confess that I have never been able to find the key." Martin Luther's sturdy word should not be forgotten: "A council can not make that be Scripture which in its own nature is not Scripture."

Is not Marcus Dods' ringing utterance worthy of our adoption: "He, and he only, is the true Protestant, who knows that God has spoken to him in Christ, and who knows this irrespective of any infallible authority separable from Christ himself, whether that authority be the authority of the Church or the authority of the Scripture"?

In a word, "Come to the Church through Christ, not come to Christ through the Church."

Note.—Forsyth: "It was not the Church that produced the Bible, nor the Bible that produced the Church. It was the grace of God that produced both."—*Contemporary Review*, Oct., 1905.

### C. *The Subjective Element.*

Protestant writers recognize the existence of the subjective as no less real than the objective.

"Taste and see" is the Bible word (Heb., 6:5; I Peter, 2:3). St. Bernard says: "Nisi gustaveris, non videbis. Non illud eruditio sed unctio docet: nec scientia, sed conscientia comprehendit." Bernard is simply echoing the lesson of the beloved John: "Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things" (I Jno. 2:20, 27).

In the life of the Apostle Paul how intensely personal was this matter of religion! "I exercise myself to have a *conscience void of offence*" (Acts, 24:16).

In a very true sense Bayard Taylor repeats the thought:

"All outward vision yields to that within,  
Whereof nor creed nor canon holds the key."

Upon the great Dom of Berlin—the latest Protestant cathedral—you read, in marked contrast to the mottoes of St. Peter's in Rome, the text that tells of the inner life of the soul: "This is the victory—even our faith" (I John, 5:4).

Given the Bible, *plus* an unbalanced mind, what foolishness may issue! To balance text by text, to weigh this chapter and that paragraph, and wisely to consider the setting of each verse, how sober the task! It surely does demand "an interpreter's skill, a saint's insight, and a historian's judgment."

The learned Anglican bishop, Boyd-Carpenter, says: "Every science, like every monarch, is at best but a *constitutional* monarch, and is bound to answer for its actions at the bar of reason and common sense."

Our brilliant expounder of "The Baptist Principle" offers this contribution:

Mr. W. C. Wilkinson: "Baptists believe strongly in obedience, but not less strongly they believe also in common sense; they could not be the scripturalists they are if they did not. 'Common sense' is a broad mark branded everywhere on the face of the Bible, and inseparably waterlined into its texture. Unless a man has some common sense, and uses it, he can not know the Bible aright. Other things being equal, the more common sense a man has, the better he will know his Bible."

It has been always difficult to resist the fascination of one-sided observation. "Be logical," each new sect has cried. "Be logical," the Arian demanded; "Jesus Christ is the son of God; a son can not be coeval with his father." "Be logical," said the Nestorian; "Jesus Christ was man and was God. He was therefore two persons." "Be logical," cried the Sabellian; "God is one, and therefore can not be three."

Coming to most recent time—the last twenty-five years—Ritschl and his brilliant coterie have been contrasting logic and life. The "orthodox" were not sure that religious experience should be the test of religious truth. Now, in the latest battles of Continental theology, the followers of Ritschl are sore pressed by the new school of rationalists. In one sense this means a momentous crisis in Protestant thought; in another sense it is the revival of old methods.

Is not Pascal's dictum the lesson of common sense? "The two extremes must be avoided: the *exclusion* of reason and the admission of nothing but reason."

Shall I heed the word of George Macdonald? "He doubteth God most who feareth to doubt."

In the opening sermon of the last Pan-Presbyterian Council the distinguished preacher used his own translation of II Cor., 10:1 as his text, and from the translation "I beseech you by the reasonableness of Christ" educed his theme: "Reasonableness the Touchstone of Truth." In support of this proposition, he cited from the master of one of England's greatest schools the following word, significant, surely, as to modern thought: "Reason lies nearer to us than any external authority; no outward evidence can be sufficient to overturn its testimony."

#### *D. The Name of Jesus.*

"Mr. Tennyson," asked a friend, "what is your greatest wish?" "A clearer vision of God," he answered. Mr. Wordsworth put on record the same thought:

"Behold an emblem of our human mind,  
Crowded with thoughts that need a settled home,  
Yet like to eddying balls of foam,  
Within this whirlpool they each other chase  
Round and round, and neither find  
An outlet nor a resting place!  
Stranger, if such disquietude be thine,  
Fall on thy knees and sue for help divine."

Robert Browning's lines bring the same conclusion:

"I say the acknowledgment of God in Christ,  
Accepted by thy reason, solves for thee  
All questions in the earth and out of it,  
And has so far advanced thee to be wise."

Hear John Bunyan:

"Let the most blessed be my guide,  
If't be His blessed will,  
Unto His gate, into His fold,  
Up to His holy hill."

Dr. McLaren, at the Baptist World's Congress, gave as the keynote, from the president's chair, as the countersign for twenty million Baptists, as the supreme source of all authority, the name above all others, "The Name of Jesus." Can we not all accept this principle: "The Lordship of Jesus"?

Men may be keen in philology or shrewd in psychology, may be widely read in the literature of ecclesiology, may have much information as to the varieties of human experience; but the soul without Jesus is surely adrift.

"He can not preach; he never has been touched," was the sad criticism of a church worker as to a pastor. The Christless thinker can never preach Christ. "*My sheep hear My voice*" (Luke, 10:22; John, 3:11). Over the desk of the great Franz Delitzsch he kept a little picture, "Christ Walking with His Disciples." "May I follow Him" was the learned exegete's constant prayer.

May I quote from Dr. Clifford: "The coming theology will have for its chief distinction the return to Christ in history and in idea, in person and sway, as 'all and in all'—our primary means of surely knowing God, interpreting and defining Him."

And Dr. Lorimer: "The Bible enables us to see the sun of righteousness; but it is the sun itself that guides us on our way. The sacred Scriptures are the outer garments and insignia of our Lord, by which we recognize His character and His dignity; but He, not they, is the supreme rule of our faith and practice."

Upon this point Dr. Van Dyke gives a summary: "Christ is the light of all scripture. Christ is the master of holy reason. Christ is the sole Lord and Life of the true Church. By His word we test all doctrines, conclusions and commands. On His word we build all faith. This is the source of authority in the Kingdom of Heaven."\* Let us neither forget nor hesitate to appeal to it always with untrembling certainty and positive conviction. Is not this the lesson of II Cor., 10:5? Bring "every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ."

A revelation of God is still progressing in humanity. Christ is working miracles every day in every part of Christendom. The Holy Ghost is constantly repeating Pentecost in many an upper chamber. Within, in the very soul of the Christian, is found the crowning evidence of Christianity.

\*In Christ we see the Father; from Him we receive the Spirit; and through Him we all have access by one Spirit to the Father.

Are there not humble women in Wales to-day who know more of the Bible and of The Way than was ever written in the most learned tomes of the greatest ancient Fathers?

*E. The All-Sufficient Source.*

What shall we do now with these several sources: (1) Bible, and (2) Church, and (3) Christian common sense? Are these to be separate or rivals?

You know how Bazaine, in the Franco-Prussian War, surrendered his magnificent army of one hundred and eight thousand men at Metz. When brought before the court martial he sought to defend himself by pleading, "We knew not what to do. We could not determine the source of authority. We were not sure as to the complexion of the government at Paris. We sat in council discussing and debating in vain."

To *our* problem is there no answer? Years ago, Sir George Stokes pointed out that each of the three was but as a single thread, which may be too weak to carry the heavy burden attached to it! The intertwined strength of all the three threads may prove able to support the load.

Gore:

These are the three great chords of might,  
And he whose ear is tuned aright  
Will hear no discord in the three;  
But the most perfect harmony.

As looking towards such unity consider this formula, viz.:

Source of Authority?  
It is Christ,  
Revealed in Bible,  
Reigning in Church,  
Ruling in Common Sense.

$$A = X (B + C + C^2)$$

Does Chillingworth honor the Bible?  
Yet is not the Bible higher than Protestantism?  
Does Romanism obscure the truth as to the Church?  
Surely the Church is higher than Romanism.

Does Rationalism demand recognition for the subjective?

Who would deny the power of the subjective? and yet, is not Christ "all in all"?

Why not unite these elements as Paul does in Phil. 2: 12, 13: "Work, for it is God who worketh"?

This formula dare not be confined to precise terms for each soul. No Procrustean treatment, ignoring the right of private judgment, can be endured by Protestantism.

Long as God makes no two souls alike, our formula must be indeterminate. "Smith gives the Smithate and Brown the Brown-ate." The objective and subjective endure separation no more than could the Siamese Twins, while over all reigns the one Lord. Dr. Fairbairn's statement measures the situation exactly: "The historical fact then remains,—the person of Christ has given reality to the life of the Christian religion, and actuality both to its belief in God and to the God it has believed in."

In the old church of Santa Croce—Westminster Abbey of Florence—the artists grew weary of Giotto's beautiful frescoes. Over the walls they dashed a coat of whitewash. That was easy. To paint something better,—ay! there's the rub! The centuries have given no new masterpieces. Now, for sixty years, chemists—skillfully, patiently—are removing the whitewash, restoring Giotto's frescoes of Faith and Unbelief, Death and Life Everlasting.

So, in the history of thought, men cry out, "Away with the old." Blotting out the face of Jesus, blurring the resurrection-glory, is that novel or difficult?

Meanwhile, above all the guesses and hypotheses and novel and revolutionary propositions, you hear one unchanging anxious call; over and over the weary, waiting heart of humanity breaks out with the old cry, "We would see Jesus."

Whitewash is cheap. To restore what ruthless hands have blotted out is slow, expensive work. But it is worth what it costs, to win back the vision we had lost. The nations that sit in darkness rejoice in seeing the Light. With them we unite to say, "Thou, O Christ, art all I want."

**THE PRESIDENT:** The first appointed speaker is Rev. H. P. Whidden, of Dayton, O., who will now address you.

**REV. H. P. WHIDDEN:** The question of spiritual authority is one of the greatest that concerns the thought of intelligent Christians

to-day. We may not say, Mr. President, what we will about *this* subject and then "go home and look upon it as a piece of intellectual gymnastics." The problem of authority is one that is troubling honest minds and hearts in our churches to-day, and if we can only get some simple principle or principles that will help us in the understanding of what we need to understand in connection with it, I think we will find the faith of many men largely strengthened and their spiritual experience greatly enriched.

In connection with the problem of the source of authority in Protestantism, we do well to bear in mind the fact that there is a distinction between the authority that is absolute and the authority that is relative. That which all of you have accepted as authority may be so far as this company is concerned the authority absolute; but tell me why, since your conscience, or "common sense" (to quote Dr. Cheney), has given response to the moral quality in what you call your authority, it is no authority for me. The passion for the spiritual will lead me to seek authority for myself until my conscience has responded to it and has conceded that it is both reasonable and moral. We need to remember also, in the consideration of this great question, the fact that the mere intellectual acceptance of a certain person or principle as authority over us will not constitute it in the highest religious or spiritual sense the final authority for us. And that is why we, as a branch of the Protestant body to-day, know that in determining the authority for the individual there is something more required than a mere process of intellection. It is so easy to accept authority if it be merely a matter of bringing our judgment around to the point where we can easily say that this thing is perfectly fair and right. It reminds me of the definition of faith given by a young man about to take orders in the Anglican Church. On being asked to define Faith, he said, "Faith is believing that which we know is not true." And a great deal that will follow as a result of such a definition may be accepted as authority if we will to see it in that way. We must guard against the temptation to accept as authority only that which we want to accept. No man is at liberty to accept merely what he may desire to accept. Remember, this same principle does not permit a citizen of the United States, who has come here from other lands, the privilege of doing absolutely as he pleases, but it does give him the liberty to do anything that is right and reasonable according to the judgment of great and wise men who framed the Constitution and made the laws.



And when these have appealed to his judgment and his conscience, then is the law of the country a real and lasting authority for him. Now, if we will bear in mind these, and other things that might be mentioned, I think we can very readily see that if we are to have a real authority, it must be one which appeals to us, not simply as thinking people, or as those who believe without thinking, but as thinking people who are both moral and religious in our instincts.

Dr. George W. Northrup used to say to his classes, "Gentlemen, I must have a moral God." So we believe that he who is the great Consistent One would have us accept no authority which does not satisfy the deepest part of our moral nature. Is it possible to make the Church authoritative and have it satisfy the deepest that is in us? Possibly so. Is it possible to have the Bible made authoritative, solely authoritative over us, and have it meet the requirements of this test? Possibly so. Let us look at another question before proceeding to answer these. What shall we regard as a sufficient reason for believing that we ought to have a source of authority? Because of the God-consciousness that is within us. And that God-consciousness within us demands and accepts a divine revelation from God in which there shall be at least a part that is definitely expressive of his will, and so has the right to be authoritative over us. For, of course, in the last analysis the will of God is the source of authority for Protestantism.

Now, then, if we believe that in the expression of the will of God in revelation, in some part or all of it, is to be found the source of authority, just where and what is it? Is it to be found in Nature? No, not there; certainly not there alone. Is it to be found in the Church? By no means there alone. Is it to be found in the Bible? I do not see how it can be found even there alone. Is it not to be found in the supreme expression of God in his revelation to men? I think we must feel that primarily the source of our authority is in Jesus Christ, because he is the consummate expression of the will of God in all the revelation of God to the race. And what if we find that we must not accept first of all the Scripture as the source of authority, but Jesus himself? Will that destroy the value of the Scripture for us? I think not. As Kaftan has finely expressed it, "One always begins by accepting what is traditionally given on authority. But we must not stop there. As everywhere, so in religion, one must attain to a faith and knowledge really one's own." And this most surely comes from Jesus as primal source and not from the

Bible. Now, I do not see any reason why we can not still have the Scriptures as authoritative over us, while Jesus Christ is the ultimate source. In respect to what do we want our Scriptures to be an authority? Marcus Dods has well said, "Do we want them to be infallible in respect to style, character, grammar; in respect to history, sociology, science?" And the answer comes from every mind and heart here, No; we want the Scriptures to be authoritative in respect to the great religious problems of the soul. And will they be? Are they authoritative in respect to this matter? When we turn to a passage in Genesis that is somewhat difficult for us to harmonize with certain passages and quotations found in the New Testament, it is not necessary to decide immediately that we must cast aside that which is difficult to understand in Genesis. But come back to the person and words of Jesus Christ, who is the ultimate source in Protestantism, and interpret once more him and his teaching. I will come back to him. I will study again and understand better if I can his word, and then if the response of my conscience is perfectly free and unchecked I will return satisfied that I have the truth. I will now come back to my difficult passage in Genesis, not to harmonize, but to discover what is its simplest significance when considered as a part of the record of God's way of dealing with men who are to be agents in giving his fullest revelation to the world.

The authority of the Old Testament is not found in its facts and figures, but in its account of the sublime process of God's great redemptive plan and purpose. And it is after we have made Christ and his word the chief source that all the warm truth of the Old Testament breaks through its cold and often seemingly inconsistent statements and we have its real authority.

With one illustration I close: I had a college mate who, like myself, was supposed to follow as a textbook in ethics the work of Ezekiel Gilman Robinson, which is known to most of you here this evening, "Principles and Practice of Morality." That book was in a large measure a mystery to my friend. The professor believed in its teachings and expounded as well as he could the ethical principles of Professor Robinson so far as he had written them in that book. But the student was far from being satisfied of its use as an authority on moral philosophy. A year later, however, he took a course in ethics under Dr. Robinson, the author of the book, at the University of Chicago; then he discovered that, with

the author as the authoritative teacher, the book had a right to live not only in his library but in his life.

The Bible will have most authority for us when we make Jesus our ultimate source and authoritative teacher.

**THE PRESIDENT:** The next appointed speaker is Professor C. L. Williams, of Granville, O.

**PROFESSOR WILLIAMS:** It is a part of wisdom to see things as they are, in their right relations and in their proportionate values. If one can do this, he is prepared to put the emphasis where it belongs. This our Lord always did. He taught that the body was more than raiment and that institutions were made for man, not man for institutions. Acting on this principle, he overturned much in his day that was as ugly as it was hoary with age. He ranked himself above the Old Testament and he repealed some of its legislation. He called men into personal relations with himself. He was himself the strongest reason men could have for accepting him as their Lord and Master.

We are so constituted that we cannot be at our best unless we are under the control of what is better than we. Our most luminous and elevating experiences are those in which we freely yield ourselves to be mastered by what is really worthy of mastering us. We never speak with so much authority over others as we do when feeling that we speak under the authority of some one greater than we are. You can strike harder from above than you can from below, because in the former case you have gravitation for your ally.

As Protestants we bow to the authority, not of a book but of a person, Jesus Christ, who was God manifest in the form of man. Him, "the contemporary of all the ages," we acknowledge to be our King, our Law, our Guide and our Light. He speaks to us as one having authority, the authority of what he is in himself. We concede to him the right of supremacy over our minds and over our hearts. Our wills are ours to make them echo his will so far as we can do so. Where may we learn his will concerning us? In the Bible, especially in the New Testament. How? By reading it under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, because a man cannot understand the deepest import of what is written here unless he is moved by the same spirit that moved the writers of the book. "Deep answereth unto deep."

So far as we know, our Lord did not write any book. The principal works he left at the time of his ascension were his apostles. By the Holy Spirit he so wrote himself on their minds and hearts that some of these men were constrained to write biographies of him and some wrote epistles, which contain his truth as wrought out in the experience of their authors under the guidance of his spirit. He, however, was greater than any book of which he was the subject, and so Martin Luther was right when he said, "Christ is the Master; the Scriptures are the servant."

We accept these writings because they present Christ to us. They were not the foundation of Christianity, for it had been established and it flourished quite a long time before any of them were composed. They have, however, served to keep Christian believers in touch with Christianity as it was in the beginning. Moreover, in connection with the Holy Spirit, these books have kept alive that consciousness of Christ which his followers had before any of the New Testament was written and which has played a very important part in the history of the Church. It had much to do in the work of deciding what books should be held as canonical and it has helped to preserve them until now. Furthermore, this consciousness of Christ, owing so much to these books for its unbroken existence in the world, certifies to their trustworthiness in a marvelous degree and reflects the greatest glory upon them.

We have here four Gospels that purport to give us a faithful portrait of Christ as a historic person. As presented in these documents he was entirely original in his personality. In his ideals, teaching and achievement he was generically unlike any other person before him or contemporary with him. He reconciled and united in himself what had always been regarded as contradictories in human thought. All his words and all his deeds were on the same altitude with what he was in his character. The underlying purpose of the miracles attributed to him was to help men in their trouble and thus to show God's practical sympathy for them. The miracles of Christ harmonized with all else he did, conveying to men the same lesson as to God's love for them as did the Sermon on the Mount and the Crucifixion on Calvary.

The authors of these biographies do not write as if they were giving us an idealized portrait of Christ. They do not seem to be mixing imagination with their memory of what the Master said and did. It does not appear as if they were trying to throw a soft

and dreamy grace over what they describe. They do not indulge in rose-water euphemisms or dodging circumlocutions. They do not eulogize any one, not even the Master. In narrating the tragic event of the Crucifixion they make no studied endeavor to produce emotional effects in the reader. Their language has the ring of stalwart sincerity. They record even their own shortcomings with a firm hand and with no attempt at evasion or extenuation. In short, they create the impression of being simple-minded, truth-telling writers.

As with other biographers of the same historic character, each writing from his own point of view, the Evangelists did not always agree in matters of detail when reporting the words and the deeds of the Master, but who has any good reason to be disturbed by this? For men to be inspired does not dehumanize them. Men do not have to be infallible in order to be trustworthy witnesses. Who besides a cold-blooded, conscience-forsaken lawyer tries to overturn the testimony of a witness who makes upon all impartial listeners in the court-room the impression that he is doing his best to tell the truth, but who now and then from a lapse of memory makes a mistake in some matter of small importance?

We believe these documents to be trustworthy because they fulfill the purpose for which they were written. This purpose was to give us a coherent portrait of Christ and to give us a consistent record of his work for the salvation of men. We do not believe these writings trustworthy because any ecumenical council has declared them such; for no council by its decree can make documents worthy of confidence if they are not such in themselves. Nor do we believe these Christian writings trustworthy on the ground that they claim to be inspired and infallible; because they do not make any such claim for themselves.

We are firmly convinced, however, that they are inspired, and in a higher sense than that in which any other writings are inspired. Said a heathen who was a bitter foe of Christianity, "In all our sacred books there is nothing to compare with the Bible for goodness and holiness and love and for motives to action." There is as much difference between the inspiration of the Bible and that of any other book as there is between the music of the pianola and a Steinway piano when it is the docile instrument for expressing the music in the soul of a genius like Paderewski.

As to the infallibility ascribed to these christian documents this may be said: We are very grateful that they do not claim to be infallible, for if they did, we should be sorely troubled by certain indisputable facts connected with them. Moreover, we are comforted by the reflection that they do not have to be infallible in order to accomplish their purpose any more than you, a man, have to be infallible in order to be entirely reliable in what you say.

It may sound very orthodox and very reverential toward the Scriptures to affirm, as is often done even yet, that they are inerrant to the very letter, but nothing is real orthodoxy or true reverence which is contradicted by the facts. Moreover, in view of the bitter attacks made upon these writings on account of what they actually are, it seems unfair to them to assert for them a kind of infallibility that they nowhere assert for themselves and that only serves to intensify the bitterness of the assaults made upon them. It is very unwise to hang the credibility of the Scriptures upon the theory of verbal inspiration and then to fear that if the theory falls the Scriptures also will fall. Facts are quite independent of any theory we may have concerning them. There have been many opinions as to the constitution of the sun, but what has the sun done about it? It has continued to shine.

These Christian documents, though they contain a number of discrepancies, we believe to be an unerring guide to all who would know Christ as their Saviour from sin. To make them such a guide was the end for which they were written, and this end they have unfailingly accomplished, as millions of men and women can abundantly testify from their personal experience. Judged by the soundest principles of criticism, the gospels and the epistles give us a coherent portrait of Christ and a consistent record of his ministry. We, therefore, are not disturbed by such discrepancies as may be found in the New Testament, especially since they are not of a kind to interfere with the purpose for which the book was written.

Who that reads and enjoys the dramas of Shakespeare is disturbed because the dramatist, from either ignorance or carelessness, now and then departs from the facts of history or geography? His regnant purpose was to portray human nature as it is, in its weakness and strength, in its glory and shame. This he did with a fidelity to the truth of human life so complete and with a realism so intense that you can almost hear the mad gasps of King Lear or the dying groans of Desdemona. There are spots on the sun, but does not

the sun give all the light needed to whiten our orchards with blossoms in the springtime and to cover our fields with billowy grain in the summertime?

The Christ of the creeds and of history is the Christ of the New Testament. He is the same yesterday, to-day and forever. As John Stuart Mill once said, "Whatever else criticism takes from us, it leaves us Christ." Very true, and the light of Christ, self-verifying as he is, criticism can no more extinguish than it can extinguish the light of the stars that shine and tremble in the diadem of the night. We, as Protestants, bow to the authority not of a church, nor of a book, but of him, a person having all power in heaven and earth. We heed what he says because he speaks to us with the authority of what he is in his personality.

He speaks to us with the authority of truth. A heroic philosopher of the Middle Ages, as, amid the encircling superstitions of the time, he struggled toward the light, said to his persecutors, "If you will show me the truth, I will bow to it and, if need be, I will follow it to the ends of the earth on my knees." To a normal mind nothing has more authority than truth, especially if it is embodied in a person. There is tremendous weight in the words of a man who has made it clear beyond all question that he is a truthful character, that he has no lies in his blood and that he has no deceit in his mouth. You could not have listened to a man like Thomas Arnold of Rugby, Mark Hopkins or Martin B. Anderson without feeling that he had a divine right to dominate you for the time being because of what he was in the truthfulness of his life.

This was vastly more true of Christ than of any other person that ever lived. Men and women used to go not simply to hear what he had to say, but to hear him, which was a somewhat different matter. He still lives, and by his Holy Spirit he speaks over again to us the words of his recorded in the New Testament. These are words of truth. They stand for realities, as we are able to say in a measure from personal experience. Noting the correspondence between what he says about us and what we know about ourselves, we are minded to say, "Well, Master, thou hast spoken the truth." The words of Christ go down further into our souls than we can go by the most penetrating introspection. He interprets us to ourselves and our conscience certifies to the correctness of his interpretation. Knowing in this way that he speaks the truth when telling of matters within the range of our present experience, we are moved

to accept as true what he says when speaking of matters beyond the range of our present experience.

He speaks to us with the added authority of love. Nothing has more authority over the human heart than love. We pass under the power of the things we love the most fully and we tend to resemble them in the flavor of our life. When men love gold so passionately as to make a god of it, their hearts are likely to become like gold, but only in its quality of hardness. You have, no doubt, read the story of "Silas Marner." You remember that springtime with its opening buds and singing birds returned to the withered and wintry life of the weaver of Raveloe when he transferred his affection from his hard-earned guineas to the fresh, young soul of little Eppie, the outcast that wandered into his house one night, and when he became the docile servant of his love for her, the golden-haired queen of his heart. There is no captivity so binding, so delightful and so regenerating as that of a passionate affection for an object entirely worthy of its devotion.

We are born to be mastered, and all the choice we have is as to who or what our master shall be. We deem it most wise to be mastered by the best. The best is the love of Christ ruling in our hearts and bringing every thought into captivity to him. All his commandments based on truth are spoken to us in his love for us, and the love with which we perform them is but an echo of his love for us. We are drawn into the submission of love for him, because he submitted to the death of the cross for us.

We are not so much concerned to know what men think about the church, the creeds or Christianity as we are to know what they think of Christ; for what they think of him shows what they are godward and manward, too. When they pass judgment on him they pass judgment on themselves. The lives of men are an answer of some kind to Christ. The sun looks down light upon the meadow and the meadow looks back clover blossoms, which are the fragrant answer the meadow makes to the gracious ministry of the sunbeams. Speak, Lord, for thy servants hear. Thy will is their law.

THE PRESIDENT: We have a card handed up to us of Rev. E. A. Hanley, D.D., Cleveland, O.

REV. E. A. HANLEY, D.D.: *Mr. President*, I have been deeply stirred by the able discussion of this vital subject. With the general



trend of thought I am in hearty accord, but I think the whole matter is more simple than we have yet made it appear.

Authority in religion is not a complex, uncertain or far-away somewhat. Nor is it at all involved with the fortune of documents and ecclesiastical institutions. It is characterized above all else by the fact that it is something personal and immediate. Great confusion has come from thinking of authority in religion as analogous to authority in civil law—the greatest error Protestantism has ever made. In legal matters authority is impersonal and statutory; in the religious life it is personal and spiritual. In law authority is external, being satisfied with outward obedience; it makes no appeal to the governed for his approval of its reasonableness. But authority in things spiritual appeals directly to the thoughtful appreciation of every man, and, whatever his outward life may be, it can never be satisfied until he has ratified its command in his own inner life.

Authority as understood by Protestantism has primarily two elements: God, whose character is its source, and man, whose spiritual nature is its recipient. This authority is of the nature of a personal relation between God and man, its fundamental assumption being that man is made in the likeness of God and is capable of sharing his thought and moral appreciation. According to this conception, authority is that personal and immediate relation between God and men wherein he awakens his moral and spiritual life in them.

Reference has frequently been made this evening to Jesus Christ as the source of authority, and the question naturally arises, What relation does Christ sustain to God in this matter? It would seem that our thought is not altogether clear on this point. Does Christ intervene between the soul and God and take upon himself divine authority? Does he share this authority with God, so that we have a joint source of authority? Or does he as a vicegerent merely reaffirm the authority of God? None of these things. Jesus is the highest manifestation of God's character and will towards men, and as such he reveals what is authoritative for the spiritual life of man. In other words, Christ is the medium revealing that righteousness and love of God which are the source of authority. The Old Testament and, especially, the prophets were a great medium of God's revelation to men. The Christian Church is such a medium; indeed, in a measure, all human history is such. The moral and spiritual life of man is also a medium. But, crown of all, the life, teaching, death and

resurrection of Jesus Christ, as recorded in the New Testament, is the fullest medium of God's righteousness and love. By his revelation of the Heavenly Father, Jesus has brought authority into the realm of a personal relation. The essential point is powerfully stated by the author of the Book of Hebrews: "God, having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners, hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in his Son." Authority, then, as understood by Protestantism may be simply and comprehensively stated as *God speaking unto men in Jesus Christ*.

And the glorious thing about this authority is that it comes with its own certification. It possesses self-evidencing power. It needs no bolstering up by means of ecclesiastical councils, philosophical speculations or inerrant documents. Whenever the truth of God is seen it awakens an immediate recognition in the heart of man. And whoever sees the truth of God's love and holy will cannot ignore the authority that speaks to his own heart, except by such a stultification of his spiritual nature as must amount at last to moral suicide.

This view of authority is full of hope and power. It seems to-day as if authority in spiritual things had evaporated. The note of divine command has all but disappeared from the proclamation of the gospel. Preachers have been confused, and are not able to disengage authority from methods and results of criticism on the one hand, and from lifeless forms of tradition on the other. That ancient formula, "Thus saith the Lord," has been inadvertently put in the past tense, whereas it was employed to declare a present revelation. But whoever once clearly sees that authority has to do with a personal and immediate relation of God to the spiritual life of man need not stumble on account of documents or theological formulations, but may stand before men with the full assurance that God who spake to men of old is still speaking to-day.

THE PRESIDENT: We now have another card, that of Rev. J. Avery Herrick, Bay City, Mich.

REV. J. A. HERRICK: *Mr. President:* I am somewhat in the situation of Mr. Hanley. The interest of the papers presented and the subsequent discussion have suggested the simplifying of the matter even yet farther. There seems to be unanimity of opinion in that

the Scriptures are not regarded as the supreme authority for Protestantism. The authority has been placed by one speaker in the scholastic school of interpretation of Scripture; the findings of scholarly exegesis are declared authoritative. It appears to me that by this we, as Protestants, are reduced to a papacy almost as bad as the Catholic Church; namely, we are dependent upon the scholars for what authority may or may not be in Protestantism.

The other two or three speakers have almost practically agreed upon the authority of Jesus Christ. If we understand by the authority of Jesus Christ the authority of Jesus as a person, I think that is a legitimate deduction. If, however, the utterances of Jesus are authority, then, again, we are at the mercy of the critics. For many people, who can and who have determined for themselves what Jesus meant when he spoke, the word of Jesus is authority. But these commands are first approved by conscience. So that the whole matter of authority to those who even claim Jesus as authority, and to those who claim Scripture as authority, resolves itself into a matter of duty as it appears to the individual conscience. The duty conscience, or the sense of what I ought, as I appreciate it and learn it from Jesus, my Master, is then the supreme authority for the Protestant. The authority lies in the individual. It is, as Dr. Foster would put it, the "duty consciousness"—the sense of "ought"—and is equivalent to the voice of the Master to him.

The value of the Bible lies in the record of the soul struggles of great men toward duty. God realized himself through these struggles and the revelation came through the ever noble call of duty—the ever refined sense of "ought" conceived as the will of God. And the New Testament is that history of the soul, carried to its climax in Jesus, who continues and completes the soul struggles recorded in the Old Testament. It is the duty conscience in the Old Testament that reveals God; it is the duty conscience in Jesus which reveals God. Jesus expresses this thought when he says, "I do not these things which are pleasing to myself, but the things which are pleasing to my Father"; and again, "I come not to do my own will, but the will of the Father who sent me." Hence the supreme authority of the Protestant is what was the supreme authority of Old Testament saint and to Jesus Christ—the call of duty—the sense of "ought" conceived as will of God. Jesus will appeal to us just in so far as we have a keen sense of duty. He is like us in his soul struggles, hence attracts us; he is greater than

us in his victories over temptation, hence he humbles us and convicts us of sin. His personality, being the incarnation of "ought," the embodiment of the spirit that impels us to do the will of God, this personalizing of obligation to respond to the will of the Highest, corresponding to the same spirit of obligation within ourselves—this is supreme authority for the christian.

So I may conclude the Scriptures have been to my mind the most essential means of enlightenment for my sense of duty. Our Saviour has been to me my Lord and example in that he lived the life of duty and was true to the voice of his Lord, his God and Father.

THE PRESIDENT: The hour is now so late I think we should close. The session to-morrow afternoon will deal with the question "How far should religious instruction be given in the State schools?" Let us rise and sing one verse of "Jesus, Lover of My Soul," and I will ask Rev. Mr. Johnson to dismiss us with a closing prayer.

REV. MR. JOHNSON, of Linwood, O., closed the session with prayer.

## SECOND DAY.

*Afternoon Session.*

Wednesday, November 15th.

3 P. M.

The third session of the Congress was called to order by the President at three o'clock.

THE PRESIDENT: Let us sing hymn 597, the first and the last verses,

"Jesus shall reign where'er the sun  
Doth his successive journeys run,"

after which I will ask Brother Whidden to lead us in a word of prayer.

REV. H. P. WHIDDEN offered prayer.

THE PRESIDENT: The topic for discussion to-day is "How far should religious instruction be given in State schools?" The first writer is the Rev. George W. Lasher, D.D., of Cincinnati. (Applause.)

REV. GEORGE W. LASHER, D.D., then read as follows:

#### HOW FAR SHOULD RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTIONS BE GIVEN IN STATE SCHOOLS?

In the outset of this discussion we distinguish between Religion and Morals. Our word morals, coming from the Latin *mos*, plural *mores*, has regard to our relation to our fellow-men. It concerns the manners, the customs of society, the laws of the State, the amenities of this mortal life, the character—all that goes to make up the man, without regard to another life. Religion, on the other hand, has to do with our relation to God, the recognition of some being or beings above and beyond ourselves and the present life. It has regard to unseen, spiritual beings, and it reaches into a life, or a "shade," beyond the present state of existence.

It is true that a man's morals and his religion are closely associated, and that the one affects the other. Both have to do with the

character, the essential manhood. But a man may be moral, may be even punctilious in his behavior and his habits, may be an observer of the laws and customs, may conform to all the regulations of society, and yet be indifferent and even antagonistic to all religion. An atheist may be a moral man, an observer of every law of society; but an atheist cannot be a religious man, obedient to the first and the great commandment. It has often been said that the first table of the Decalogue has to do with man's relation to God; the second is concerned with man's relation to his fellow-man. The first table is religious, the second is moral.

Our subject concerns religion, not morals. It is not a question how far the State may go in the promotion of morals, the improvement of the manners and customs of a people, but how far the State may engage in the religious education of its people. Of course, by "the State" is meant what is known as "the body politic," the political power and authority, having regard to the well-being and good order of society, the social fabric. No one disputes the right of the State, even the *duty* of the State, to regulate morals, to teach morals, to compel the recognition of great moral laws or principles—principles derived from and supported by divine law. It has been said, and is no doubt true, that the laws of Moses, as revealed in the Jewish writings, are the fountain and source of the moral laws of the present day in our own and in all Christian lands. Men have found that all the great principles underlying the best society to-day are derived almost directly from the Mosaic statutes. And yet one can recognize the validity of those statutes, their moral fitness, their broad and unchanging principles, without having any reference to the supreme source of those laws. Men make a distinction between the moral laws of Moses, those pertaining to society—the relation of man to man—and those pertaining to worship, the ceremonial laws, having regard to the relation of man to God.

The Hebrew people combined the moral and the religious elements in their theocracy. They originally knew but one source of authority, and they received all from the mouth of God. This was especially true until the desire to be like other nations prompted them to ask for a king. And even the king was held responsible for the religious as well as the moral conduct of his people. He held his office by virtue of a divine appointment. Christianity does not compel its adherents to go back to Moses, nor to the theocratic rule of that elder day. It has always recognized a distinction between

the temporal and the spiritual, even when both were supposed to be lodged in the same person. Protestantism has broadened the distinction and concerns itself only with the relation of man to God.

Under the old theocracy the religious and the secular were intimately associated; the Church, if we may so call it, was supreme and ruled the State. The Church of Rome and some of its offshoots have insisted upon the same relation between Church and State in the Christian system. The Popes have always claimed the right to ratify the choice or the succession of a king, and to place the crown upon him. Protestantism, on the other hand, has insisted, not that the Church should be ruled by the State, but that each is supreme in its own sphere; that the two are to be co-ordinated and act in harmony, each taking counsel of the other, neither dominated by the other. True, not all Protestants have clear views on this subject. Not a few (and some of the stronger) denominations of Christians still hold to the view that the Church should dominate the State, and that the State is bound to recognize the laws and the institutions fostered by the Church. Not satisfied with the provision that Christian men, by vote and by personal influence, may control the affairs of State, working reformation by virtue of weight of character, of superior wisdom and prudence, they would have a *minority* rule. They would have "the Church" get together and determine what laws and regulations should be put in operation, and then demand of the State that it obey the will thus expressed—the will of the Church—before the question has been fairly submitted to a vote of the people. There are those among us, however, who are mindful of the great principle set forth by such as Roger Williams and other thinkers, in England and America: that the State has nothing to do with religion; that its province is secular, and that it has fulfilled its duty when it has guaranteed to every man the right and the opportunity to cherish, enjoy and propagate his religion "without let or hindrance," so long as he does not interfere with a similar right on the part of his neighbor.

Not a few among us are still somewhat muddled on this point, but it is still adhered to by some, and is making such progress as to encourage the hope that, some day, Baptists, at least, will be found consistent in their claim that Church and State are, each in its own sphere, supreme, and that neither should dominate the other. We are crying out loudly against "the boss" in politics, and it ought not to make any difference whether "the boss" be a political club,

or a club under the guise of a church, or a congress of churches. There are churches hardly less political and hardly less domineering than are the most active political clubs among us. It may be permitted to say, in this Baptist Congress, that they who do such things are not genuine Baptists.

When we pass to the realm of education we find that education is the development of the man, whether in body, mind or soul. We find that to educate a man is to add to, or develop his personality, to increase his capital, to make his life worth so much more to himself and so much more to society—the world at large. It does not follow, however, that this education is to be bestowed by some other than himself. A certain amount of education may be, and should be, given by parents, by the family, by the State. But it does not follow that the parents, society or the State must keep up the educational process indefinitely. The individual owes something to himself, and is capable of doing something for himself, unless he be imbecile.

Every individual owes it to himself and to society to make the most possible of himself. It may be set down as a duty of parents to educate their children to the fullest extent possible to themselves and their financial resources. It does not follow, however, that all the estate of the parent must be expended in giving the highest possible education to children. There are limitations. Other things are to be considered besides a formal and pedagogical education. The parent may do much for the child by giving him opportunity for self-culture, by enabling and encouraging the child to take advantage of circumstances and conditions for physical, mental and spiritual development. In very early years the education must be largely dogmatic. But as years increase, the inductive and the illustrative take the place of the dictatorial. If parents were always all that some are, there might be no need of another school than that of the home. But, as things are to-day, we are unwilling to leave the education of the young entirely to parents. Such a course is found to be unsafe, and to endanger the existence of the State. So the State steps in and says that, for its own preservation, and for its best interest, the child—every child—must be educated, and it undertakes to prescribe the extent of that education, fixing at least the minimum.

Justly conceived, the duty of the State to itself requires that it educate *for citizenship*. For its own sake it must see to it that all children are educated according to a certain standard. And what



the State owes to one child it owes to every child within its jurisdiction. It can justly make no distinction—no exception. If a certain amount of education is essential to good and wholesome citizenship, then every child within its reach should be educated to just that degree; and when that is attained the duty of the State ends. We lay down the broad principle that the duty of the State is to educate for citizenship, and only for citizenship, and that what it does for one it is bound to do for all. It has no right to set a standard of education above what it can justly give to every individual—except, of course, the imbecile or the incompetent.

The State has no right to select out a portion of its citizens and give to members of that class a higher and a better education than it gives to every other class, except, as we believe, those whom it pledges to serve it in a specific capacity—in army or navy—in subsequent life, holding them to a specific contract for service. It has no right to tax its citizens for the higher education of the few. It has no right to tax its citizens to provide schools and instruction, when it is evident that only a portion of its children can avail themselves of the advantages thus afforded. Education is capital, and the State has no right to take the wealth of one citizen and bestow it upon another citizen. If the State undertakes the education of its citizens, it can do it only on the ground of self-preservation, and only on this ground can it insist upon the education of all its citizens. Having given to all what it gives to one, the State must stop. It has no right to go farther. It has no right to discriminate between citizens, favoring a certain class at the expense of another class.

The State may educate in morals, and it is bound to do so, because upon good morals its life largely depends. The *mos*, the *mores*, the manners, the customs of society, is what gives to the State its stability, or character. It is this which distinguishes largely between different countries, or States. The social fabric is largely a matter of recognized principles, a consensus of opinion as to the best principles for the government of human life and the formation of human character, in and for the present world. Beyond that the State cannot go. It may consider and determine great principles and forbid certain acts, while it enjoins others simply that it may preserve and foster its own life. Beyond that, it must leave every individual free to seek his own happiness in his own way, according

to his own conceptions of happiness, whether having reference to the present or to the future life.

The State can do nothing looking towards a future life. Its own life is temporal, having regard only to the present age, or æon. The State can neither enjoy nor suffer in a future world. It has been well said that nations have no future life. They must receive their rewards and their punishments in this world. Consequently, we have learned that nothing in Statehood is absolutely indestructible, nothing absolutely permanent. No national boundaries, no national institutions are unchangeable, eternal. The State is temporary. It is for the present time—for a section of time. So morals, the laws, the customs, the great principles of Statehood are for the present, not the future life. The State may and must teach morals.

But religion has regard to a future life. What contemplates only the present life is not strictly religion. Religion recognizes the existence of unseen, spiritual beings. It is founded upon a conviction that there is a life, or an existence, beyond the present, and that there are spiritual beings who have something to do with the present and especially with the future state. It appeals to something within us which is not strictly, simply morality, custom, law, good living. It recognizes a soul, an essential self, which will have a conscious existence when this material body shall have crumbled to dust. Religion recognizes deity; it may be the Jehovah of Abraham, of Moses, of David, of Paul, or it may be the Zeus, or the Kronos, of Greece, or the Buddha of the Hindu, or the Ancestor of the Chinaman. Religion is a matter intensely personal. It is a matter between the individual soul and the object of its worship, a being which the worshiper regards as immeasurably stronger than himself and calls his God. Religion may be founded on historical facts, facts resulting from the intervention of the deity in human affairs, or it may be the calm acceptance of fatalism and the expectation of a sleep in which the soul shall become more and more attenuated, until it loses its identity and swoons away into everlasting *nigban*. Between these two conceptions of the human soul and its possible destiny are a thousand diverse conceptions, every adherent being assured that his, and his only, is the true religion. With no one of these has the State anything to do. It is not the province of China to teach Confucianism or Buddhism; neither is it the province of England to teach Hinduism in her Indian empire. Neither is it the province of the United States to teach either Ro-

manism, or Protestantism, or Mohammedanism, or Fetichism in the Philippine Islands. Individuals, or missionary organizations, may teach what seems good to them, and the State has no right to interfere; but the State, the United States as a government, has nothing to do with the religion of the islands. And if our government may not teach Romanism in the schools of the Philippines, no more may it teach Romanism in the schools of America. If it may not teach Romanism, it may not teach Protestantism. If it may not teach either Romanism or Protestantism, it may not teach the dogmas of any one of the hundred and fifty sects into which our religious people are divided.

We who are here present claim to be Christians. We accept the Bible as the word of God, and Jesus Christ as the revelation of the Jehovah of Moses and of David. To us our religion is very dear. Nothing could induce us to part with it. Some of us would endure burning rather than deny the power of Christ Jesus to save the trusting soul. But there are all around us those who do not accept our faith and do not want their children to be taught our faith. They claim the right to educate their children in their own faith, as we claim the right to educate ours in our faith. If we would not have our children taught the faith of the Romanist, or the Spiritualist, or the Mormon, so we cannot demand that the children of either of these sects be taught our faith in the public schools. If parents who are not religiously with us allow or invite us to teach their children, we will gladly do so; but we cannot demand that they give their children into our hands, nor into the hands of the State, for religious education.

The State cannot engage in religious education without infringing upon the rights of a large proportion of its citizens. Even in Russia, or in Italy, or in Austria, not all the people are of the same religious faith. Both Russia and Austria have large Jewish populations, and Protestantism is making progress in Italy, as it is also in Spain and in France. Germany has Roman Catholics, Protestants and Jews; the first two almost equal in numbers. No genuine American can fellowship the idea that Germany or Russia would be justified in compelling the children of these various religious sects to receive the same religious education. And yet such a course would be more practicable, because the people are more homogeneous in either of the countries mentioned than in America, because there nearly all the teachers are of the same religious faith, whether

Roman Catholic in one instance, Greek Church in another, or Lutheran in a third. But in America the law and the administrators of law are forbidden to make any religious test, whether for a public office or for a teacher's position in the public schools. None of us would justify a school board in an inquiry into the religious faith or practice of an applicant for a position in the schools; consequently, we have persons of all religious faiths, and many with none whatever. While in the country at large many teachers are earnest Christians, members of evangelical churches, yet there are Jews and Roman Catholics, Unitarians, Universalists, Spiritualists, Mormons, and a large proportion with no religious affiliations whatever, practically agnostics. To compel such teachers to conduct religious exercises with our children would be to breed dissensions and strifes and greatly damage our school system. To compel a teacher to instruct children in a religious system with which he has no sympathy would be not only a great injustice to the teacher, but would insure more harm than good to the pupil. If permitted to teach his own views, the unbelieving, agnostic teacher could only do harm to our children. The Roman Catholic cannot teach Protestantism, neither can the Protestant teach Romanism. The agnostic can teach neither the one nor the other. As a rule, our schools are manned by young men and young women, few of whom have acquired any definite and positive religious views. They know a few things, either to believe them or to disbelieve them. We are greatly troubled with the lack of knowledge on the part of those upon whom we rely in the Sunday-school; how much less fit for such work is the average public school teacher! It is much easier to get right ideas into the mind of the child when no other than the parents has touched it than it is to get out the wrong and get in the right after an admired and magnetic teacher has filled it with wrong notions and falsehoods. But if religion is to be taught by the State, we must submit to what the State gives. No parent ought to allow his child to be led astray by the false conceptions and crude notions and willful misrepresentations of the possible public school teacher.

But it is argued that under the old Jewish code the children were to be taught all the same faith. It was commanded through Moses: "These words which I command thee this day shall be in thine heart: and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children." True; but the cases are widely different. In the first place, there was only one religious system to be taught. That was the true

religion, coming from him in whom is right and out of whom is wrong. In the second place, there were no public schools, in our modern sense. In the third place, the command was to parents, and not to the State. Even the Jewish State did not undertake the education of the children in the theocratic faith. That was a matter for the parents to care for. The family religion and the State religion were one and the same. All that was for times quite unlike ours, and all has been done away by the changed conditions. The New Testament does not present the matter in the same light. It commits religious education, beyond what is imparted by the family, to those whom the "Lord of the harvest" may send forth into his harvest; and he expects those who have received the precious faith to teach others also, including, no doubt, their own children, as young Timothy was taught by mother and grandmother. The truth of God is too precious, and its right conception is too important to justify its commitment to any except those called of God by the direct agency of his Spirit, or by virtue of the law of inheritance. He to whom children have been committed of God must be held responsible for their instruction in the things of God.

As we Baptists understand it, the religion—the only religion—worthy of God and of value to men is that which comes by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ and by virtue of regeneration by the Holy Spirit.

We cannot be true to ourselves, neither can we be true to our God, unless we insist upon the need of regeneration for every soul of man, even the children in our public schools. We cannot justify ourselves in favoring anything less than the most radical and imperative requirement of a living faith and a regenerate heart. We have no business to lower the standard set by our divine Master, who taught that the essence of his religion consisted in faith in him—a faith which comes by operation of his spirit in conviction of sin, and in the exercise of faith in him who gave himself for us that we might live in him. We are convinced that this condition of mind and heart cannot be effected through education. We have learned that the "scholar" may be as far from it as is the scavenger, and that hope for the latter is often better founded than is that for the former. We dare not think that the child can be educated into Christ. We cannot believe that any human power can put a soul into Christ. After all that it may be possible to do in a public school, there still remains that mysterious process, known only to the Holy

Spirit, by which the soul now "dead in trespasses and in sins" is delivered from the power of death, and from him in whom the power of death resides, and made a new creation in Christ Jesus. We cannot, by our manipulation, effect that change. Our preliminary education may be good, but we know only too well that it is possible to "educate" until we have passed the limit of divine grace and mercy, all our efforts having failed, while the poor, unlettered heathen goes into the kingdom of God before our pupil.

But we are told that we can at least read the Bible in the public school, and thus checkmate or forestall the evil one. There are those who are grieved because the Bible is not in every public school. They insist that the Bible may and should be read in the audience of all the pupils. They would have it read, they say, "without note or comment," every day. But they cannot agree upon what portions of it should be read and what portions omitted, and they declare that they would not favor the reading of every chapter and every verse. They would omit such passages as Genesis xxxiv, Numbers vii, Deuteronomy xxii, Numbers xv, 20-63; Judges xviii, xix, xx, The Song of Solomon, Hosea ii, and a great many other passages of the Old Testament, before a company of children; and few of us would read every chapter and verse of the New Testament before such an audience. Shall we leave it with the ungodly and unsympathetic public school teacher to make his own selections? And if it is said, "Let us make the selections from the Bible upon which all can agree, and let those portions be read in the schools, without note or comment," we answer: The thing is impracticable. It has been talked of for many years without avail. As soon as we undertake it, we find that we must take counsel of the whole multitude of the people, and we find that it is utterly impossible for all to agree upon any particular or possible selections. Let the selections be made and submitted to us, and to all, and then it will be time enough to compel the reading of selections from the Bible.

If we leave the matter to the teachers, we find that there are among them those who rather delight in reading objectionable passages; and we are powerless, because we declare that God's word can not be otherwise than profitable for all readers and for every man. The truth is that, our theories fail and break down just as soon as we resolve to put them to a practical test. There has been ample time to prove them true and valid; but, since we have reached this point without having proved them true, we have reason to doubt

their practicability. We are crying out against the educational code now in use in Great Britain. Nothing has so stirred our Baptist hearts for two centuries as the effort of the English government to impose a certain kind of religious education upon all the children in the public schools. And yet, what England is doing is nothing more than what would follow if we were to undertake religious education in the public schools of these United States. We protest against the conduct of the majority in England; what would the majority do in America?

We are persuaded that the only course for us to pursue is to commit the mental, and, in degree, the moral education of our children to the State, for a limited time, and enjoin upon parents and Sunday-school teachers and pastors, and the devout and honorable and zealous people of our churches, their religious education, assured that thus it will be much better than it is possible to do it in schools conducted by the State.

THE PRESIDENT: The next writer, according to the programme, is Pres. E. B. Bryan, LL.D., of Franklin, Ind. I am informed that he is not present, that he cannot be here. We have another speaker on this subject, Rev. Allan Hoben, of Detroit, Mich., who is also absent. The Secretary informs me that this is the first time in the history of the Congress where two appointees on one topic have failed to come up to their appointments, and it certainly is very unfortunate that these two should fail. This is going to leave considerable time for discussion, and I hope you have your minds made up to send up your cards to the Secretary, that you may speak on this subject, so that we may fill out profitably the time allotted to us.

I am permitted to call next, as the first appointed speaker, Rev. T. C. Johnson, D.D., of Charleston, W. Va. (Applause.)

REV. T. C. JOHNSON: I am sorry that I am left all by myself; it makes me almost afraid. But I am not afraid of Dr. Lasher; I have known him so long, and I have a very high regard for his opinions. I shall start out by saying that I understand by State schools is meant all schools established by the State, and supported by the State. I wish to say also that, in my opinion, the State itself must determine what it shall have taught in the schools. The Church may advise, but the State is free, and must do as it deems wise and best.

First, let me announce positively, with some positive arguments for the position, that I believe the State should, to a certain extent, teach religion in its schools. How far should religion be taught in the State schools? In the first place, it should be taught to the extent of having the Book of God read in the public schools. I believe that the Bible belongs to the State—if not as much as it belongs to the Church, yet it is God's message to the State as well as God's message to the Church—and for that reason the State should give some attention to it, and should give its pupils instruction, or at least give them the opportunity of learning from its pages.

The Bible is the grandest of all textbooks. It looks to me like slapping God in the face to exclude his own great book from the public schools of the people. I believe that God has a right to be heard in the public institutions of our country; I believe he has a right to be heard by the pupils in the public schools.

The Bible is the very foundation of all our institutions; our very morality is built upon it. Indeed, if there was no Bible there would be no morality, and the morals of the country must have the solid basis of the Book of God for their foundation.

I will go even farther than that, and say that religion should be taught in our public schools to the extent of giving the pupils the fundamental elements of religion. They should be taught about God; they should be taught the belief of this country, even about the Lord Jesus Christ. I believe they should be taught the Commandments. I believe they should be taught the great principles of the Sermon on the Mount; and I believe there is much in the Book of God that should be taught the pupils in our public schools. More than that, these religious elements should be wrought into every tissue of the mind of the people. It is a dangerous thing to give education without the religious element. You will educate intellectual monstrosities, and you will take away the essential foundation of citizenship in our country.

Again, I believe that religion should be taught in the public schools to the extent of giving instruction, especially with reference to the relation which the State sustains to God regarding the relations and the responsibilities that rest upon the citizen; I believe the State has something to do in this respect with religion. I know States have no future, but I believe that religion has something to do with the present life, as well as the future; I believe that religion has something to do with the outward as well as the inward. The



powers that are ordained by God, the officers of the State, are the ministers of God; and the citizens of the State are the body politic by the appointment of God, and as such have responsibilities as citizens to the God who gave them their being and position in the body politic. The State, then, I believe, should learn what the Bible has to say with regard to its relations and responsibilities, and its duty to learn involves its obligation to teach these fundamental principles to its pupils.

But now let me refer, with the limited time I have, to some of the objections that are made to teaching religion, to any extent, in the public schools. I have already indicated that there is a limit—that the State should go so far in this matter, and no farther. There is the idea of the separation of the Church and State. What is the separation of Church and State? Certainly not a separation between God and State; evidently not a separation between religion and State. The separation between Church and State simply means that State governments and Church governments are independent of each other, and, as has been said, each supreme in its own sphere. That does not touch the idea as to a State's right to teach religion to a certain extent; it can do that without trespassing in the least upon the great principle of the separation between Church and State.

Then there is the idea of religious liberty, that great boon which we enjoy in this country as nowhere else. We are told we are interfering with the religious liberty of our citizens. What is religious liberty? It is the liberty every man has to worship God, or not, as he pleases. It is the liberty every religious body has to organize upon its own principles, and believe in whatever creed it pleases, or no creed at all. But religious liberty is not religious anarchy; it is not unbridled license. The doctrine of religious liberty does not interfere with the liberty of the State. If the State has something to do with religion, it has a right to do that something; it has some liberties along those lines as well as others.

Then there is the idea of the liberty of conscience. Perhaps that differs somewhat from religious liberty. There may be religious liberty without any conscience involved; but liberty of conscience is the great bugbear to many, in the way of reading the Bible in the public schools, or in giving any religious instruction whatever there. But what is liberty of conscience? It is the concession which the public conscience makes to the individual conscience. The time was when

the public conscience was narrow, unevangelical, bigoted, selfish; the public conscience demanded the union of Church and State; the public conscience demanded that there should be no religious liberty; the public conscience demanded that the individual conscience in every respect should be governed by it. But the Bible was spread abroad in the land, the principles of the Reformation were diffused among the people. The public conscience became evangelized to a large extent; it became unselfish; it got some idea of the rights of man as man, and the public conscience began to make concessions to the individual conscience. It gave the largest liberty consistent with its own preservation. But, again, liberty of conscience is not anarchy of conscience; liberty of conscience does not mean unbridled license of conscience. The public conscience has not abdicated its throne; the public conscience must not abdicate its throne; and private conscience must have some regard for public conscience. Indeed, there are things that the public conscience must demand, in spite of private conscience. Our country does not, can not, give absolute liberty of conscience. The Quaker is conscientiously opposed to war, but he is not free from military service on that account. The Mormon conscience may demand polygamy, but he is not granted the privilege of practising polygamy on that account. Private conscience might demand human sacrifice in some cases; but this country will not grant the liberty to offer human sacrifice in this land.

There are some cases where the private conscience must give way to the public conscience, unless the public conscience abdicates its throne and grants absolute liberty or unbridled license to all sorts of whimsical consciences.

Now, it is said that the State has nothing to do with teaching religion. What is religion? What do we mean by religious instruction? There are various departments of religious instruction. There is the instruction that pertains to the relation of the individual soul, its spiritual relation to God. With that the State has nothing to do. And there is that department of religious instruction which has to do with a system, a general system of theology. With that the State has nothing to do. And there is that sphere of religious instruction which has to do with a man's relation to church organization, to the ecclesiastic. With that the State has nothing to do. But there is a department of religious instruction that concerns the State as such; that concerns the citizen as such; that has to do

with the responsibilities of both in this life; and with that department of religious instruction the State has something to do. It has something to do with the very elements of religion in building up true character, in building up anything like a complete character. The public school, the State school, can not be an entirely secular institution, in the very nature of the case, and in connection with its very mechanism. What is the State school for? It is to make good citizens; it is to give the masses sufficient education to qualify them for citizenship and the various pursuits of usefulness and happiness in the country. But you can not make a good citizen without the religious element underlying all his education.

Let me tell you, it is a question deserving of serious consideration as to whether the great carnival of crime sweeping over our country in this day, the terrible political corruption, is not largely due to this very fact, that God is being excluded from the public schools. Men are being reared up without this basal foundation of their education; their consciences are being neglected, and they have no fear of God before their eyes and no regard for man.

But, it is said, if you are going to teach religion, what religion? Why, in this country, the Christian religion, of course. It is nowhere written on our statute books that this is a Christian nation, but the very foundations of this nation are Christian; the name of God does not occur in the Book of Esther, and yet there is not a book in the Bible with more of God in it. It may not be policy to declare this nation a Christian nation, but at heart it is a Christian nation. If it was not we would not possess or enjoy the liberties under which we live. Yea, it is not only a Christian nation; it is a Protestant nation. Yea, more, it is not only a Protestant nation; it is an evangelical nation, so far as the fundamental principles of its government are concerned. Spain is a Catholic nation; England is a Protestant nation; the United States, in essential principles, is an evangelical nation—that is, its fundamental principles grow out of the evangelical idea of religion, the separation of Church and State. It is an evangelical idea; religious liberty is an evangelical concept; liberty of conscience has grown out of purely evangelical religion. And, my friends, I believe that it is the duty of this country to teach the rising generation the fundamental principles upon which this nation rests.

You say, Let the Church teach the religious principles. Why not let the Church govern all education, then? If it is necessary

for the State to educate the masses, is it not just as necessary for the State to educate the masses in these essential principles underlying the State? The Church can not reach the masses until the millennium, at least until its work would be unnecessary; and the State that undertakes to educate the masses must, according to the deepest philosophy, train up the religious nature to a certain extent, at least with the intellectual nature. The State must, in order to its own preservation, give this education.

Friends, it is no little cause of alarm that ten millions, one-eighth of our population, are receiving a religious education the fundamental principles of which are diametrically opposed to our system of government. I am not here to hurl any invectives at Romanism. They have religious liberty; they can teach their principles; they have a right to propagate their religion; but they are teaching their children principles subversive of the very foundation of this government. You know, and I know, that if the Romanists were in the ascendancy in this country, the separation of Church and State, religious liberty and liberty of conscience, would not long abide, and I do believe that Romanists and Mormons and Atheists and Anarchists should, somehow or other, be taught the fundamental principles—not have them forced upon them; but they should know the principles upon which the country is founded; and I believe the country has a right to demand that they shall understand the principles upon which it is founded, and I don't believe there is any religious persecution in that idea. I tell you we must educate and, to some extent, religiously educate, or we will perish by our own prosperity. The Book of God is knocking at the door of the public school, and gently suggesting that its rejection is not only a sin, but it is a curse to any people, while it forcibly proclaims: "Blessed is that nation whose God is the Lord." (Applause.)

THE PRESIDENT: Brethren, will you send up your cards? There is Prof. Brown on this side, and Brother Crane on this side, who will take any names. This is a vital question that comes home to us. We all ought to be prepared to say something upon it. We are not like we were yesterday. Yesterday afternoon we sold out long; to-day we sell out short. Here is Prof. Pollard, of Georgetown, Ky. (Applause.)

PROF. E. B. POLLARD, Ph.D., : "I did not know that I should be the first one; I wanted a chance to further gather my thought, because I found myself differing very much from my honored friend and brother who has just spoken. I think there are several arguments against the position we have just heard. I find myself rather more in accord with the first speaker.

The historical argument, it seems to me, is against the position that the State should undertake religious education. I know there are dangers under the system in which we are now working in our country; but I believe the historical argument is against the State's undertaking this work. Conditions have been worse, far worse, under such a union of Church and State as that which would come about by the position advocated by our brother. The fact is, the State is incompetent to do the work, and has proved itself incompetent from the very beginning. Wherever the State has undertaken to be the religious teacher of its sons and daughters it has failed in inculcating the highest morals, and it has failed in inculcating the purest and most vigorous religion.

If we had more than ten minutes I think it would be possible to show the failure of the old system, and we certainly have not tried the new long enough to say that the new has failed.

Now, there is an argument that comes essentially nearer to the matter in hand. From the nature of religion, it seems to me it is impossible for the State to go into it at all. Religion takes cognizance of the inner life; the State can only take cognizance of that which is without. The State can only punish that which is outward; the State's machinery is material and outward; the State can take no cognizance of a man's morals unless he outwardly violates some law; the State is dependent upon the good morals of its citizens, and yet the State can not deal with morals in the abstract. It deals with morals as the morals express themselves in outward conduct. I believe the inculcation of morals, so far as the principles are concerned, is largely left with the family and Church, and from the nature of the case must be so.

Then, the constitution of the State itself suggests difficulties, it seems to me, which are insurmountable. Our brother, Lasher, has already pointed out some of these. If we are going to teach religion, it must be some form of religion, and therefore there must be some religious test applied to the teachers in our schools; and there we have an injustice working. What right have we to apply a religious

test to the teachers that we elect to our schools? Have we a right, I say, to discriminate against the great body of teachers as regards religion?

Our brother who has just spoken says he would teach the Protestant religion. There are some States in this Union in which Catholicism is the dominating force, and in those States it would be impossible to teach Protestantism. I have in mind at least two States in which, if there was any religion taught, it would be Roman Catholicism, or else some parts Protestant and some parts Roman; and politics and religion would become mixed up. There are practical difficulties, I say, involved under our system, as well as the question of right and wrong, the question of human rights. When our forefathers founded this country the policy which dominated them was very largely one of freedom in the realm of conscience. We speak about the principles upon which this country was founded; the principle upon which this country was established was freedom; the people were looking for freedom.

I believe we must leave to the Church and to the family the inculcation of religion. We need religion; we need the principles of religion to animate our State. How can we get them? Not by the State teaching religion directly, but indirectly. The most powerful inculcation of religion is spiritual, and not the strong arm of the law. Where religion has depended upon spiritual forces for its propagation, for its maintenance, it has succeeded in maintaining its purity and power; but as it has laid hold of outward and material agencies, the arm of the law included, it has always become corrupt; and it seems to me it would be a step backward for us to turn against the principles that Roger Williams taught, which have grown in our land until they are all-pervasive. Let us keep religion pure by making the channels of conveying religion those channels which can best maintain its purity and power. (Applause.)

THE PRESIDENT: The next speaker is Rev. Samuel Z. Batten, of Lincoln, Neb. (Applause.)

REV. S. Z. BATTEN: Once upon a time, at an ordination council, a good old brother prayed that the Lord would grant unto the candidate the grace of definition. I could not help wishing we might have had a little of that grace here this afternoon. In this matter, much will depend upon your definition of religion. I can not help feeling

that the word, as it has been used here by some of the speakers, especially by the first Reader this afternoon, is used in entirely too narrow a sense. The Master was asked one day, "What is the first commandment of the law?" And he said, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first commandment, and the second is like unto it, and equal to it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. This do and thou shalt live. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." And I find the New Testament is concerned very largely with what might be called this second commandment. The question comes, What is religion? Does religion have to do primarily with a man's relation to God? According to Jesus Christ, doesn't religion have to do just as much with man's relation to his fellows? My relation to my fellow man is just as much a part of my religion as my love for the Father in Heaven. In the teaching of Jesus Christ a man's love for God is illustrated in his love for his brother man. I know that I love God because I love my brother.

Now, it is true the State may not have very much to do with one part of religion, that part that has to do with man's relation to God; but if the two commands together make the law and the prophets—and I think we may also say the gospel—then certainly the State may fairly and justly teach the element of religion which has to do with man's relation to his brother man, which is the function of the State. It is here to define these relations that exist between man, and to safeguard those relations. Throughout the world the great majority of men have an idea that religion has to do only with Bible-reading, church-going, and thoughts about heaven, whereas the real religion is illustrated in our everyday life. That being so, it seems to me there must be some institution which shall teach men these common human duties, which shall define the relations between men in society, and shall endeavor to bring men up to the fulfilment of those duties. The Church may teach both these elements; we believe it should. It will make men know the relation between the soul and God; it should make them know also the relation between man and his brother. But the State may also teach the great duty of men in society; it may define those relations, may set up a standard for those relations, may make men know when they have fulfilled those relations.

We say the great business of the State is to prepare men for citizenship. A man is not prepared, he has not been prepared for citizenship until he has been instructed, to some degree, at least, in the great moral requirements, in the duties of man to his brother man in society; and I insist that it is just as much a part of religion—teaching a man his duty to his brother man—to be just, loving, faithful, pay his debts, pay his taxes, just as much a part of religion as that he shall read his Bible and dream about heaven. I am inclined to think the time has come for us to drop that word “Protestant.” That was a good word three hundred years ago. But we are not Protestants; we have gone far beyond that position. It was good in its day, necessary in its time, but I should rather like to coin a word and say I am an “affirmationist.”

Protestant is a negative term; let us pass the negatives and come to positives. There are certain conditions amid which we find ourselves in these times; we must face them and do what we can to prepare men for citizenship in this twentieth century.

I want to speak on one or two other points. We say a State needs religion. I believe the State needs religion, and that the State can not exist without religion. Professor Seeley tells us that we learn from history that the chief function of religion has been the creation of States. There never has been a State in the history of the world that has risen and flourished that was not dominated and controlled and inspired by the religious idea, and when religion died out of the life of the State, then the State itself crumbled. Now, religion is necessary in the life of the State; and if the churches are not teaching it in all respects as it ought to be taught, then certainly the State may intervene, and, in order to prepare men for citizenship, in order that the relations between men in society may be defined and safeguarded, and men may measure up to the standard, the State is under obligations to teach these great human duties, the relation of men to men in society.

You go into any court of law, and there is the Book that the witness is required to handle, or at least affirm, in the presence of God. Religion is recognized everywhere in our land. The State needs the idea of justice; and where shall we find that idea except in the grand idea of religion, in either one of these senses, if you want to use it in that way? The supreme court of this land has declared that Christianity is the fundamental law of the land. If that



is true, then it seems to me if this country would be true to its very constitution it must teach the great essentials of Christianity.

We are hearing much in these times about our Godless schools, especially the State University; and when an agent comes around trying to raise funds for a denominational school we will hear a pitiful appeal that our State universities are Godless. I want to say if one-half the energy that has been put into the denunciation of our State universities had been put into the creation of better Christian sentiment in the State universities, the State universities would not be as nearly Godless as they are to-day. (Applause.) That is not all, by any means. I know something about the inside of one State university, at least; I know something about the inside of one Christian Baptist heart, and I want to say there is just as pronounced a Christian influence in the University of Nebraska as can be found anywhere. It is not necessary that a thing should be simply named religion in order to be religious; you don't have to talk about God all the time to be religious. If it is not the business of the State to teach the duty of justice, brotherhood, love, fair play, I don't know what in the world the State is here for. And if it is the business of the State to teach these things, then it is the business of the State to teach religion, because these are an essential element of religion, the second part, and what God has joined together let no man put asunder. (Applause.)

THE PRESIDENT: Rev. S. Ragowsky, who is connected with religious work in this city.

REV. S. RAGOWSKY: *Ladies and Gentlemen*: I have heard several speeches, each excellent in its kind and nature; and, while there is much I may endorse in each, there is some that I am bound to oppose, for the reason Dr. Lasher's paper was not for the statesman of a legislature, and he almost left out the editor; and the Baptist minister—very few things I shall vary from him. I will state the second one gave us great thoughts in the light of a great divine, and, while I sympathize with him and would like to endorse his views, yet, as a citizen, naturalized citizen, knowing the necessity of other countries, and the necessity of this country, I can not very well endorse him in all. The third spoke in the spirit of a professor of theology, and that was right in its place; but then, I believe the question is, How far should religious instruction be given in public schools? My answer to this would be as follows:

In the first place, has a State the power to put men in office who are not believers in the Bible at all?—have they a right to put infidels in power? If they have, and if this is legal, you can't enforce religious principles at all, except through the change of politics. But I would say I am personally of opinion that the safety of our States is in the word of God, the Bible; and the safety of our citizenship, protection of our lives and property, is in teaching the children religion. It ought to be taught in the public schools. But how far can we, as Baptists, go? How far can the evangelical denominations go? I would say, in the first instance, I would rather prefer a cut Bible than no Bible at all. If there is an objection on the part of Catholics and Jews and Quakers and others to the Bible in the public schools, I would rather be satisfied with a portion of the Bible than none at all.

In Austria they have text-books, and religion is taught in the schools; but Jews are compelled to attend the Christian worship. On the other hand, room is given for the Jews to teach the Jewish religion in the schools after school hours. In this country I find the Lutherans have schools of their own, and, in places where they have public schools, and the children attend public schools, they have a Saturday afternoon set aside for religious instruction.

Now, I want to say that it lies within the power of evangelical nations to have some religion taught in the schools. We are teaching patriotism and patriotic hymns in the schools to protect our country; should we not teach religion? Should we not teach the love of man, love of God? Should we not teach honesty in business? Should we not teach the respect of the aged? They are all in the Bible, and these are things about which we could have no difficulty. But, gentlemen, let me tell you, in conclusion, my opinion is, that wherever a State does not permit the Bible to be used in the schools, we ought to use every effort to teach our religion in our homes and in our Bible schools and in our Sunday-schools. I do believe God will bless the nation that fears him, and he will curse the nation that hates him; and I do believe, from the experience of history, that when anarchism springs up, and poses under the garb of socialism, but with anarchism at its root, it is because there are no religious principles taught in the schools. Give me England and the Episcopal religion, teaching men to be content with their lot, rather than Russia with no religion at all. (Applause.)

**THE PRESIDENT:** The next card is Rev. Augustus S. Carman, Secretary of the Educational Society of Ohio.

**REV. A. S. CARMAN:** I would not have sent up that card, in view of my duties as a reporter, except that the cards did not seem to be coming up when I sent mine.

I feel a deep interest in this subject, and I have some little acquaintance with some of the details of it. My first college years were spent in one of the great State universities, and nearly six years, at another period, were spent at one of the greatest of the State universities. I have had occasion in the last seven years, also, to be brought into very close, intimate connection with what I suppose would be considered a typical denominational school. I am deeply interested in the discussion this afternoon, and, as much as anything, in noting the personality of the debaters, for it has been a debate. I believe very thoroughly in what has been said by our Brother Lasher, that a great deal of religious activity and life is compatible with State universities. I know that some of the Godliest men are teachers in these schools. I have always been charmed with the marvelous ability of Dr. Angell, at Ann Arbor, to carry the situation. He is a diplomat, world-famed, as we know, and the man seems to be able to carry, by the force of his personality and his wisdom—to carry the religious element just far enough, and not too far; and no serious objections have ever been raised to the amount of religion which he injects into the life of the institution, which is in a State of strong Christian sentiment, and where the faculty are very largely of pronounced Christian affiliations. Some ten or a dozen members of our church, when I was pastor there, were very active in it. However, I was compelled, after my experience as a student, and my experience as a pastor, to note certain very serious deficiencies, especially since I have come into such close connection with a Christian school.

In the first place, the chapel attendance can not be made compulsory in a State school. It is dependent upon the whim of the student, and only a bare handful are at the religious exercises in any State university. When I contrast that with our weekly attendance of perhaps forty, almost any one of whom could be put in charge of the religious exercises; when time and again a spiritual appeal has been made to these young men, based upon those things which are dear to us, and I see the young men responding to it—

not flinching from it—I see with great thankfulness the opportunity which the Christian school has, which the State school has not—never can have. I believe the duty of the denominations is to come close to the State school, take care of the young men and young women there.

I think we should carry the definition of terms farther than it has been carried; I think we fail to discriminate between the duty of the country composed of citizens and the duty of the State as a State. Much of the argument that has been given on both sides we would all have agreed to, had it stated simply the duty of a parent, the duty of an American citizen. Our duty is to give religious education, as well as education in the merely material things, to all citizens. The fact that religion is the underlying foundation of the State's power is something all can assent to. Whose duty is it to proclaim these higher sanctions—the sanction of religion, sanction of an eternal God—whose duty is it to teach these things? Is it the duty of the State? Is it even the privilege of the State? Here is where we part company. Our Baptist forefathers succeeded in bringing about an idea of separation—the separation of Church and State—but the idea has never been adopted by all denominations. We have still the fight to fight over the idea of the separation of the teaching function when it comes to the matter of divine appointment, the idea of the adoption by the Church itself of the responsibility for this teaching, the idea of the utter inadequacy, the utter impropriety of the State's attempting to discriminate between duties, or to teach these internal features of life. Now we come, it seems to me, to the moral side. I feel very deeply that this discussion arises in large part from the failure of the Church and the Christian home to do its duty; from the attempt to shift off on to the State, to which we are giving ever enlarging socialistic functions, this duty. The duty lies in the home, lies in the Church for all society—the duty which we owe as Christian citizens toward the land we love, the State under which we live—the duty to see that our children first are properly trained. In even that we are sadly deficient; the family altar is broken down. We must insist upon rearing it again in Christian homes. We must emphasize the duty of ministering to every family in our own churches; the plan of adopting true Sunday-school working, which is having a renaissance at this time; the taking, not only our own, but other children to our care. It must be done; it is probably as great a need as any

presented by those who wish the public school to take it up, or the State. It is the duty of Christ's followers, the duty of those who believe in the separation of Church and State, to take this up; not to go back a hundred years to the old, worn-out, sad union of Church and State.

I wish to refer to the fact embodied in the organic law of this great region, the Northwest Territory, that the Ordinance of 1787 has the following: "Religion, morality and knowledge being necessary to good government and the well being, the happiness of mankind, therefore schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." You notice the joining of religion, morality and knowledge; I puzzled over it long, until it occurred to me that at the time of the promulgation of the ordinance education was in the hands of the Church, the common schools were in the hands of the Church. We dare not shift the spiritual responsibility which God has placed upon us. (Applause.)

THE PRESIDENT: We have one more card and one more speech, Rev. Charles Sumner Brown, pastor of this church. (Applause.)

REV. CHARLES SUMNER BROWN: *Brethren*: Until about twenty minutes ago I had no thought that I should say a word in these discussions; I have been too busy with other things. But it seems as if it would be worth while for me to express a few thoughts, inasmuch as there is an opportunity given to you and to me. In the first place, I want to call attention to still another distinction we are all agreed upon here, and that is that, for the most part, the religion in which you and I are most interested—the real religion—is a thing that is not taught; it is imparted; it is indefinable. We teach a great many precepts, a great many principles, a great many doctrines; but we trust that religion shall go from life to life over avenues so refined, so mysterious, so subtle, so impossible of definition, that you understand what I mean when I say that religion can not be defined, can not be taught as chemistry can be taught, as mathematics can be taught.

Now, the question is, Should religion be taught in State schools? That is the way this reads. Well, I'll tell you, it *is* taught, and it *is* imparted; it is imparted on a far larger scale than it is taught; but it is taught in a great State university adjoining that of which the

last speaker spoke. The charter of that great university, which was received in connection with a great grant of land in one of the fairest States under the sun, in an early day, distinctly stated that forever there shall be taught morality and religion in this State University; and it is left largely to the Christian character and backbone of presidents of such universities, and of citizens and of ministers, to determine how great or how small an influence religion shall have. It is about as well defined as "an influence" as in any other way. I have known a president of that University to say: "Now, any one who wants to go to chapel can go, any one who *wants* to; but you don't *have* to go at all." And I have known his successor, who backed up the sentence I have just quoted, to say: "I have a right, as president of this University, to invite and exhort, and to add my *example in favor* of attendance at the chapel, where the Bible shall be opened and prayer read; you are not obliged to come, but I have a right to exert my influence to have you come." I know how that great State hunted this country up and down to find such a man, and he who has stood for thirty-five years as the Dean of that faculty told me three things were required. The first question was, Is he an active Christian man? The second, What is his position upon the question of temperance? I forget the third, but those stood at the top. I felt I ought to speak, because I don't quite agree with Dr. Lasher—we ministers, he and I, have measured swords before on the question of the minister's relation to the public schools. I believe my relation to them as a citizen, as a man, as a minister of God, is to put all the religion into every pupil, every teacher, every member of every school board, that I can get in, at every opportunity and in every way; and I have always found large opportunities, as a minister of Christ, to put religion into the public schools. I have gone to the Dean's office in that great University, as I went to all members, old and young, throughout my flock, and said, "I just came in to pray with you to-day," and he has bowed in that great, spacious office with me in prayer. And when I got through he poured out his heart to God, while the doors of that great office were locked as we bowed in prayer for God's blessings on the students.

You can not enforce religion, of course. You can enforce certain requirements of morality, the law can, the State can; but I think, brethren, although it is a delicate question for me to present

on short notice, it seems to me, even a Baptist—although in theory we always contend for a separation between the State and Church—we know the State can, it is able to enforce to a certain extent. Of course we can enforce very little religion in that realm which has not a moral expression; but I am wondering, really, in all seriousness, whether it is not our privilege as Baptists to seek and secure and apply (what is practically sought and secured everywhere), that our teachers shall be Christians. Most of the teachers in this city are Christians; Dr. Crane, born and brought up here, says that is true. We can not have the Bible in these schools, it can not be read daily; but is it not our privilege and our duty to work with all our might to get as much religion as possible into these institutions? If we do not we are going to suffer for it. The good old denominational academy has passed before the onward sweep of the high school; and the great body of our young men who enter the ministry get their preparation for college in schools where the Bible is not read daily. I tell you, I believe it becomes you and me to seek with all our might to put just as much religion as possible, and to take the position that, whereas it is optional, that men *ought* to acknowledge certain great fundamental principles, *e. g.*, that there is a God. You know it inspires the confidence of the people in a candidate for office in the United States if a man be able to say, "*I believe in God, and I respect this great book, the Bible.*" That book is read in our Congress, it is held in the hand in our courts, it is opened in so many places in our public life; that book, to which, more than any other, our jurists, judges (men who interpret the law) turn constantly. We need not apologize for trying to get the great fundamental precepts, those upon which all do agree, acknowledged in all phases of our life. We have got to get religion, the Bible, and Baptist principles close to these great State schools, or this new mighty war cry of our denomination of "Education" is going to lose its power. In the State to which I have referred, in a single State university, there are more young people from Baptist homes than in all the denominational schools of the same grade; and when they select a man in such a State school to teach the Bible, as they do in some, or have a professor to devote a part of his time to giving instruction on the Bible, are we the men to go about and say, You must not teach any religion in the State school? It seems to me that we

are the very men who ought to demand in every hour, on every occasion, religion shall be imparted in the State schools. (Applause.)

THE PRESIDENT: The Secretary wishes to make a few announcements.

THE SECRETARY made an appeal for new members.

THE PRESIDENT: Shall we sing the doxology? and then I will ask Dr. Oliver to lead in a word of prayer and benediction.

The doxology was sung, and the session ended with prayer by DR. OLIVER.



## SECOND DAY.

*Evening Session.*

Wednesday, November 13, 1905.

8 P. M.

---

THE PRESIDENT: We will open with singing "In the Cross of Christ I Glory," after which the Rev. M. Thomas, of Columbia Baptist Church, will lead us in prayer.

THE PRESIDENT: The subject for discussion this evening is, "What is the Function of Ordinances in Religion?" The first writer is Prof. W. O. Carver, D.D., of Louisville, Ky.

PROF. W. O. CARVER, D.D., of the Southern Baptists' Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky., then presented the following paper:

## THE FUNCTION OF ORDINANCES IN RELIGION.

Ordinances in religion are rites imposed by authority. Religion may be defined as Man's God-consciousness and those beliefs and practices in which this consciousness finds expression. The God-consciousness constitutes the foundation and presupposition of all religion. It is the cause and guarantee of the religious disposition of man. The interpretation of this God-consciousness and the definition of the relations involved in it make up one side of the religions of men, of which the other side is made up of the conduct of man in response to the demands he finds in his relations to the God revealed in consciousness. The first element is subjective, the apprehending and the partial and progressive comprehending of the Infinite, God. This element issues in theology. In the other element man appropriates God and devotes himself to God in response to the demands of the relations he has found to maintain between himself and God. The first form in which this element casts itself is worship. Later religion develops ethics as a sphere of its expression.

and finally it comes to include the entire man in all his activities. Worship is in part purely psychic and inward, and in part externalized in physical forms, rites, ceremonies, and institutions. Whether in all this the unfolding of the religious consciousness is autonomous and independent, or is stimulated and directed by God, does not affect the fact that men will have religions; but it does seriously affect the character of the religions. As a matter of fact, all religions of extensive development have introduced the element of divine direction into the beliefs, and have applied it more or less fully to all phases of that development. It is in the sphere of this element of divine direction that ordinances find a place. The authority by which they are enforced may be either that of the Divinity directly, or of the religious institution conceived as acting for the Divinity, or of some individual with an accepted claim to speak for the Divinity. The authority that imposes the ordinance is ultimately that of the God apprehended in the individual consciousness.

The two elements of religion, belief and worship, arise and inhere in the finite spirit, and both find their object and objective in the superior or Infinite Spirit. Religion, then, is the method of union of the two spirits, the infinite spirit of God, believed in and worshiped, and the psychic self of the worshiper, who apprehends God in faith, and relates himself to Him in worship. On its human side, religion is the going forth of the spirit to find and commune with the Infinite. The true and ultimate end of that quest must be inward and spiritual. But this is too abstract for the beginnings and, indeed, for any temporal stage of a religion, unless there is something more concrete to be associated with it. "A purely speculative idea of divinity does not constitute a religion; it is constituted by the idea which is realized in the worship, and is by it judged and redeemed"; and the purely spiritual idea of God is too abstract for intelligent worship on the part of men undeveloped in abstract thinking. If religion depended on and consisted in the purely spiritual conception of, and response to, God, then it could not be in possession of man in his earlier career; and, indeed, any but a primitive career would be impossible to him at all. Religion would, in that case, never exist. There must be some meeting point for Divinity and humanity; some place, act or exercise, in which the worshiping spirit so meets its God as to feel sure that the meeting is real and pleasing to God. At this point all the elements of the religion meet and are unified. Here there is the definite apprehen-

sion of the God and the direct worship of Him. Here the external worship corresponds so completely with the inner principle and experience as to be only the externalizing of the inward experiences. Now, ordinances—recall the definition—meet this demand of religion. They constitute the meeting place between the worshiped and the worshipping spirits; they constitute a tryst between the two, and by appointment of the worshiped Spirit—by his authority. Since ordinances are of Divine appointment, they also constitute the union, the point of merging and of transition between the objective and the subjective in worship.

The demand for ordinances is intensified for religion by the sense of guilt, and that, too, on whatever grounds one may explain this conviction. For, however you explain and name the feeling, its practical effect is estrangement from the God whom we must worship. In worship man seeks to stand well with God, feels that he must stand well with God, and yet knows that he ought not to stand well. If he seeks the needed reconciliation by means consonant with his own nature, and on his own initiative, he will be placing God and his religion wholly on man's own plane, depraving his notion of God and degrading at once himself and his religion. He needs that propitiation shall be determined by appointment, or at least by approval, from the godward side; that the meeting place with God shall be of God's appointing.

It is for these reasons, in part, that we find so strong the tendency everywhere to seek and to assign Divine authority for all the forms of worship; for thus is gained at once a sense of security in the approach of the Divine and a genuine worth for the form of worship. This is illustrated in the development of the worship of Israel, especially in the punctilios of Pharisaism. It finds illustration, also, in the Roman Catholic exclusive dispensation of salvation by means of sacraments, which "the Church" only can administer because God has so decreed. Of the same nature is all sacramental significance of the Christian ordinances, as when baptism is supposed to have regenerating effect. The doctrine of restricted communion may well be studied in the light of this function, too. Is there among those who so practise any feeling that it loses its value by overleaping the bounds of the appointing authority of the Lord? It certainly appears that one element in the grievance of the excluded Christian of the open communion faith is the notion that he is being deprived of an opportunity for holding tryst with Christ.

Over against the tendency, already noted, to multiply ordinances is the consideration of the effect of ordinances on the universalism of a religion. The inclusion in the religion of any ordinance not based on a common human experience and appreciable by all men will limit the acceptance of the faith. If the ordinance has any function not in support of and in harmony with the principle of objectifying and realizing a subjective fact in experience possible and intelligible to all, it acts as a localizing tendency, and so far cuts the religion off from a universal career. Equally would it be impossible for a religion to become universal without ordinances. Indeed, we have already indicated that it could not even get a start. Out of this primary function as the unifying focus of all parts and elements of religion grow other functions, which may be regarded as specializations of this more comprehensive function.

I. The ordinance is a conservative factor in religion. All forms of worship are conservative in religion, and in the centre of these, as at once most sacred and most universal of the elements of worship, is the ordinance. Its tendency is to fix limits to religious belief and speculation. It serves to hold in concrete form the attained ideas of God's will and of relationships to God. The fundamental idea becomes a fixed element in the religion, and until it is discarded as outgrown, or surrendered as unauthoritative on some other account, the ordinance marks a fixed limit to the changes of both popular and scientific theology. The basal idea of the ordinance may be enlarged or modified quantitatively, but can not be qualitatively changed. Such qualitative change in the ordinance makes it really a new ordinance, and could not come but for an antecedent loss of the idea of the significance of the ordinance. If there has been such a loss while the ordinance has continued in practice, largely emptied of its meaning, the form of the ordinance may then be refilled with a new meaning and so become another ordinance. This is illustrated in the adoption of many heathen ordinances by which a spirit of compromise has sought to adapt them to Christian truth, and so make easier the transition of men from a discredited heathenism to what proved to be a discreditable Christianity. The reaction of these heathen ordinances on the conquering Christianity give striking illustration of the conservative nature of the ordinances and the power of the idea of the ordinance to avenge itself on the effort to supplant it with a new spirit in its body. Illustration of the ability of a new ordinance to use an old form is seen

also in the change in significance attached to Christian baptism. But here also we find the primal idea avenging itself, in that the form of the ordinance soon also undergoes change, and the original form, retaining the true idea, clamors for recognition. It refuses to be silenced because it is the speech of a great truth and the only language in which it can make itself clearly and constantly understood. This is the reason there can be no such thing as variant modes of the same ordinance. The ordinance is conservative, and so determinative of doctrine. Multiplication of ordinances limits the development of theology, while their diminution sets it free. This multiplication may be so extended as to cut off all advance in thought. In that case, one of two things will happen: Either the people holding the religion will become stagnant, and the religion a dead formalism, as in the case of Judaic Legalism and most forms of Mohammedanism; or, if the people have left still some worthy degree of mental and spiritual vigor, the religion will lose its significance in the multiplied forms of a religious skepticism, as may find example in the case of the Greeks, in ancient, and of the enlightened Japanese Shintoists, in modern times. Only as the ordinance is a proper exponent of a true idea, and one of vital importance, will it be able permanently to fix, or bound, theology; but in any case it will have the effect of retarding its growth. If God has spoken in the ordinances, and continues to speak in them, they are final words in religion, to which will apply in principle the apostolic injunction to "hold fast the form of sound words."

Ecclesiastical authority always tends to multiply the ordinances and so to stereotype the theology. Here arises the conflict between the priest and the prophet. The one comes from men, and his temptation is to put God's seal of approval on man's devices of thought and practice for approaching and appeasing God. The prophet comes from God with an intuitive grip on divine essentials. He needs few forms, and finds that the majority of those in vogue convey wrong, and conceal true ideas. His temptation is to fail to give proper recognition to the ordinances as concrete points of contact between his message and his audience.

II. The prophet labors under another danger, that brings to view another function of the ordinance. In the hour of his inspiration the prophet has a vision of his God, and can have small use for forms of either representation or symbolism. He sees truth with clear and brilliant shining, and wants no fixed words to hold it for

him. No form or words seem to him sufficient for the expression of the divine truth that is shining for him. He is in danger of forgetting not only the needs of his people at the foot of the mountain, for whom the light is shining through the cloud, but likewise the time when he, too, must join the people who are not looking on the full glory of the truth that now delights and dazzles him. If one is truly to apprehend and permanently hold spiritual possessions, they must be objectified for him. In supreme moments, and for the most exalted spirits, the truth may appear in its naked beauty; but for most, usually, and for all in some of its aspects, it must wear clothes that reveal its form while they conceal its brilliance. If the fundamental religious truths are to be held for development through all their applications and implications, and be applied to the practical problems of human life, they want concrete expression. Man must have counters for his religious thinking as for all other sorts of thought. Bullinger quaintly affirms: "Whosoever, therefore, shall thoroughly weigh the institution of Sacraments, he can not choose but extol with praises the exceeding great goodness of the Lord, who doth not only open unto us miserable men the mysteries of His kingdom, but hath a singular care of man's infirmity; whereby He, framing Himself to our capacity, doth, after a sort, stut and stammer with us; whilst He, having respect to our dullness and the weakness of our wit, doth, as it were, clothe and cover heavenly mysteries with earthly signs and symbols." The principle of this is true in all religions.

Until we come into perfect spiritual apprehension, we must have this sort of help, and of the language of symbolism the ordinance is the key and the justification. But the question will arise, Shall we reach the better stage, where we may dispense with ordinances because we have so clearly seen and understood the realities that we have no more need for symbols? The answer is found in part in those forms of religion that have sought to dispense with them, and in their comparative failure, in part in the uninfluential career of individuals who have dispensed with the ordinance on this ground, and in part in the fact that the ordinances have other functions that would call for their retention.

III. We have, then, next to speak of a function which Bullinger describes by the formidable term "paradigmatical." The ordinances have a teaching function for both the man who shares in them and the man who observes them. Most people learn more of religion

from what they see and experience in worship than from theological instruction. This is not saying that this should be so, or that it must ever remain so, but only that until now such is the fact. In the words of Fairbairn, "the worshiper learns by doing the things which authority has declared and usage has sanctioned as the most agreeable to Deity, what the Deity is and what kind and order of man He most approves." And it is, of course, in those forms which the worshiper understands to be the divinely appointed symbols of the character and relations of the Deity that the worshiper gets his highest and final ideas of his God. This it is that will largely determine whether man is to hold a low idea of God, and so seek to control Him by worship, or with a lofty idea of God seek in worship to "leave himself in the hands of God." Here applies the warning of Paul that he that eateth without discerning the intent of the ordinance bringeth judgment on himself.

The other side of this expository function Paul expresses when he declares, "For as oft as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till He come." This teaching function finds its fullest and highest use in the Christian ordinances; but it is to be accounted of in the ordinances of all religions, save where the ordinances are of a secret nature. Even the mysteries of a religion serve to attract attention and to teach the need for enlightenment for the religious consciousness and judgment. The value of this secrecy in the ordinances may be pushed quickly to an extreme. It excites interest and inquiry, and has a certain attraction. It was made much of in the Eleusinian and similar mysteries, and in all ages has been invoked. That it appeals to something responsive in human nature is shown by the perpetual favor of secret organizations, which sometimes have little to commend them save their secrecy. Various teachers have insisted on the value of this element in the Christian ordinances; notably did Erasmus make this the chief point.

IV. The fraternal element has its place in the ordinance as a social bond. Some such bond is needed everywhere. Two things must here be kept in mind. The social bond for the worshipers must be maintained, without breaking or losing the bond that binds them individually and collectively to the Infinite. That is to say, the social must not cease to be a religious organization. The fellowship of the worshipers must not militate to the destruction of their worship. The forging of bonds of finite union tends partly to break away

from the Infinite. Buddhism openly sought to make religion a subjective, self-earned experience, and to meet the need of objectifying itself for self-realization by means of a finite social bond. There is a strong tendency in speculative theism to ignore the social bond and develop a religion of the intellect with direct relations with God. There is a similar tendency, with very different spirit and source, in the mystics. So, too, the monastic orders represent the tendency to ignore the social bond in the personal search for the Infinite, and this is not less true that the orders are close brotherhoods; for the social relation is here, as with the Buddhist, only for the support of the personal religious ends.

In all these examples the principle of social union in a divine relation has avenged itself in various ways. Ordinances, so long as they are understood, maintain both bonds, with the Infinite and with the fellow worshiper. The social element in the Lord's Supper is too often lost sight of by Baptists, in the fear that it might argue against the practice of restricting the invitation to the ordinance, just as, no doubt, it is overdone by our brethren of the wider view.

The need for the social bond is the more obvious when we reflect on the fact that a religious community will embrace men of all stages of religious development. Edward Caird is right in principle in calling such insistent attention to the earlier stage of religious experience as the stage of objective religion, when the religion is all in terms of the outward and material; while later it grows into a subjective stage when it thinks and worships in spiritual terms. This he does with reference to the whole idea of the temporal evolution of religion, but it applies equally to the religious development of the individual. So it comes to pass that the religious community will at all times have in it individuals in all stages of this religious development. The religion is much the same for the primitive and for the mature mind, while it is also in many ways different. The roots and the ends are the same with all. The verities are one, and the worshipers should therefore "be of the same mind one toward another," and the strong should help the weak in the progress of their faith. To this end of emphasizing the unity of the worshipers in a given faith the ordinances of religions serve.

V. It remains, finally, to inquire of the effects and influence of the ordinance on the spirit and life of the worshiper.

Here the question is of the reaction of the ordinance on the



spirit of the worshiper. What does he carry away with him from his supreme religious hour and act?

In the lower stages of the lower religions the ordinance is the response to a need of the god, or, at the best, a grateful compliment to him, in return for which there comes a sense of security from harm and help in enterprises to the extent of the god's power and faithfulness. Courage for his undertakings is a result for the worshiper. That the ordinance does in some way put the divinity under obligation to the worshiper is a difficult idea to escape. Its counterpart is belief in some magical power of the ordinance to change the condition or character of the participant. How else shall we explain even the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, extreme unction, and the like? Bullinger, to quote him once more, tells us that "Peter Lombard . . . reckoneth up three causes why sacraments were instituted . . . : the first of which is so cold and weak that I am loath to move it to memory. He placeth merit in that by God's government and direction . . . man seeketh salvation in things baser and inferior to himself." When we have respect to man's interpretation of the ordinances of religion, and herein alone do they affect his spirit, we must agree that Lombard has rightly read at least what men have often supposed to be the divine will in an ordinance.

The ordinance also bears the idea, and so from the Latin has appropriated the name, of a solemn oath of allegiance to the God of the ordinance. From this idea the participant carries the deepest sense of obligation possible to him, of obligation to do the will of God. The extent and binding quality of this oath will depend upon the idea of God.

In all views of the ordinance, whether a magic charm for conjuring divinity, an oath of fealty, "the outward sign of, an inward grace," a symbol of essential truth, or whatever it be, the reaction on the life will bring the sense of security and of obligation corresponding to the nature and sincerity of the faith of the participant.

In any case the impression of sacredness is imposed and maintained. The ordinance is of divine appointment or sanction. The time and materials of the ordinance are sacred. The ordinance is itself a holy hour and exercise. Here God is. There is a sense of awe and dread. For those who have had fear swallowed up in a sense of love and fellowship here is the precious meeting with Divinity. In the immature and crude thought of the many in the lower

stages of religion the idea of sacredness does not extend beyond the ordinances and the other elements associated with the worship. But the idea of the sacred is impressed and preserved till such time as its real meaning can be seen; then it is extended to all things. God has from the first touched and claimed some things, and when man has learned intensively the meaning of that fact he will begin to learn extensively the application of the truth till all things will come to be message-bearers from God, and all things mean for the service of God, and the whole range of activity so many acts of worship of God. The ordinance is the chief chart in a school of the sanctity of the human life and of all the materials with which the man deals.

In lower stages of religion ordinances have little influence on the moral life of men. It is not distinctly a primal thought that ethics are a part of religion. But once the religion gets the ideas of worship and morals connected, religion extends its sway, with what facility it may, till it covers the whole range of possible activity. In the necessary relations of worshipers in the ordinances and elsewhere there arises the recognition of mutual obligation. The social element extends this. The idea of obligation is fundamental in religion. It may at first exhaust itself in the ordinance and in the worship, but it cannot restrict itself here. The growth of the sense of the sacred will extend the idea of the obligation. The worshiper must finally see that the ordinances express universal truth and eternal facts and relations. When this sense arrives, the spirit, in the ordinance, meets God and they are at one in thought and will. Then it is that the man reads and hears and sees the heavenly Father in all the facts and moments of his life, and the limited number of the ordinances has by virtue of making known its real lesson converted into ordinances all the commands of conscience and all the acts of the life.

Ordinances are the meeting-place of God and man, and are so for all the elements of religion. When man has learned to abide with God there can be no discord nor want of harmony in the elements of his religion. The shadow will flee away in the face of the Sun.

THE PRESIDENT: The second writer is President L. D. Osborne, Ph.D., Des Moines, Iowa.

PRESIDENT L. D. OSBORNE, Ph.D., of Des Moines, Iowa, then presented the following paper :

### THE FUNCTION OF ORDINANCES IN RELIGION.

The desire of the committee assigning this topic I understand to be that it be treated, not as a general discussion in the realm of comparative religion, as might legitimately be done, but more concretely, with direct reference to the Christian ordinances. This line of procedure will therefore be followed in the present paper.

What are religious ordinances? Canon Fremantle, whose work, "The World as the Subject of Redemption," is familiar to most of you, published a few years ago another book, much less widely read, on "Christian Ordinances and Social Progress." Here are the titles of his six chapters: "The Church System," "The Bible," "The Sacraments," "Creeds and Confessions of Faith," "Common Prayer and Preaching," "Pastoral Work." In his discussion he apparently regards all of these as Christian ordinances. But I think this is an altogether unusual conception. The term as applied to the Christian religion is more generally used to denote what he designates as the Sacraments—Baptism and the Lord's Supper; or, if extended to include the usage of the Roman Catholic Church, Baptism, the Lord's Supper, Confirmation, Penance, Holy Orders, Matrimony and Extreme Unction. The definition given in the dictionary of "ordinance" is "an established rite or ceremony," and this is the common conception, even in ecclesiastical usage.

Our question then is, What is the function of such formal rites and ceremonies in religion, and more especially in the Christian religion?

The right answer to this question depends primarily upon the answer that we give to another and more fundamental question, What is religion? If religion is mechanical, formal, traditional, the function of ordinances will be conceived as wholly different from their purpose and value for a religion that is vital and spiritual.

Even in the face of a somewhat popular tendency to emphasize the social and temporal aspects of religion there need be no hesitation whatever in making the assertion that religion at its heart is spiritual and supramundane. It is a far call from the savage, who seeks in terror to appease the angry gods, to the glad Christian, who lives in conscious, trustful companionship with the infinite, loving

Father; but the nature of religion is the same in both cases—the relationship between the man and the God. The difference lies in the kind of relationship and the character of the God. Religion is anchored at one end in the skies—or that which the skies used to stand for. Men are religious only as they come into touch with God and return by way of God to earthly affairs; or, reversing the process, as unquestionably it is possible to do, rise through earthly affairs into touch with God. Much confusion will be avoided, and fruitless discussion, by this clear recognition of what religion is and what it is not. The earthly conditions and relationships into which every man is born, the mundane duties and obligations devolving upon all who become a part of this complex human life that is, and has been, and shall be developed upon the earth—these are not in themselves religious, however beautiful and necessary they may be. Given religion, no one will deny that it must make this earthly life a part of itself, finding expression in these relationships and duties, clothing them with new beauty and deeper meaning. But given these earthly relationships, religion does not necessarily follow. The world is full of men and women who are trying to live the second great commandment without paying any attention to the first and greatest, by its connection with which the second commandment rises for the first time into religious value. Religion is an inverted tree: its roots take firm hold of heaven; its fruits are borne upon earth.

If, then, the distinctive thing about religion is this personal touch of man with God, leading out to the social touch of man with man, religion is essentially vital and spiritual in its nature. For God is spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth. And man, created in the image of God, is spirit also, and if he worships, must worship in spirit and in truth. This touch of man with God means that the life of God becomes the life of man. To be sure, among peoples who do not have an exalted conception of the nature of God, or of their gods, the spiritual content of religion may not be strongly emphasized, although even here it is never wholly lacking. But for those, at least, who have grasped the Christian thought the eternal spiritual life of God is imparted to men who come into communion with him; and religion ceases to be something mechanical, or ceremonial, or ritualistic, or pictorial, and becomes personal, spiritual, vital.

It will at once appear, therefore, that, whatever the function of

ordinances may be, they cannot be essential to religion. The very nature of spiritual communion is such that it is not dependent upon rites and ceremonies. When God and man come face to face it is enough: communion is free, unmediated, direct. This great conception may now be said finally to have won the victory over all views that have claimed an essential place for ordinances. But this has not been achieved without a long and determined struggle. It is not necessary to go outside the life portrayed in the Christian Bible to trace this conflict; only in the Christian religion, indeed, has the victory been won. Around the Hebrew temple there centered a most elaborate ceremonial worship. How do we imagine a day would be spent at the temple? While it is yet dark the preparations begin for the regular morning sacrifice of the whole burnt-offering. As the light begins to appear in the east the victim is slaughtered, the blood poured round about the altar, and the flesh burned upon the great altar of burnt-offering. Following this, throughout the entire day there is a constant stream of worshipers coming up to offer all kinds of sacrifices. Now it is a sin-offering, now a free-will offering, now a thank-offering. Here are two peasants come to present their first-born son unto the Lord, and to offer as a sacrifice a pair of turtle-doves or two young pigeons. Now a leper comes in joy to offer for his cleansing according to the law of Moses. And so the procession moves on—the humble peasant, the haughty noble, the far-traveling proselyte—some, no doubt, truly worshiping Jehovah, but many, if not most, never getting far beyond the ritual—the slaughter and the blood and the scorching flesh—from morning until night; when, last of all, in the late afternoon, the public burnt-offering is once more sacrificed.

In the midst of the din and confusion of this worship, mediated by ordinances so thoroughly that it had lost itself in them, the voice of the prophet sounds forth with a startlingly simple and original message: "Wherewith shall I come before Jehovah and bow myself before the great God? Shall I come before him with burnt-offerings, with calves of a year old? Will Jehovah be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? Shall I give my first-born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul? He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth Jehovah require of thee but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" (Micah 6: 6-8.)

"I will take no bullock out of thy house,  
 Nor he-goats out of thy folds.  
 For every beast of the forest is mine,  
 And the cattle upon a thousand hills.  
 I know all the fowls of the mountains:  
 And the wild beasts of the field are mine.  
 If I were hungry, I would not tell thee:  
 For the world is mine, and the fulness thereof.  
 Will I eat the flesh of bulls,  
 Or drink the blood of goats?  
 Offer unto God the sacrifice of thanksgiving;  
 And pay thy vows unto the Most High:  
 And call upon me in the day of trouble;  
 I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify me." (Ps. 50: 9-15.)

"For thou desirest not sacrifice; else would I give it:  
 Thou delightest not in burnt-offering.  
 The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit:  
 A broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise."  
 —(Ps. 51: 16-17.)

"I hate, I despise your feasts (the Lord is represented as speaking), and I will take no delight in your solemn assemblies. Yea, though ye offer me your burnt-offerings and meal-offerings, I will not accept them; neither will I regard the peace-offerings of your fat beasts. Take thou away from me the noise of thy songs; for I will not hear the melody of thy viols. But let judgment roll down as the waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream."

—(Amos 5: 21-24.)

I am perfectly aware of the Hebrew custom that emphasized contrasts by the denial of the opposite truth, without any intention of absolutely discountenancing it. And it should probably be granted that, in these utterances of the prophets, they had no intention of denying the value, or the divine sanction, of the sacrificial worship centering at the temple. But it must also be conceded that here is presented a form of religion that rises into the realm where ordinances cease to be absolutely essential. It was a long step on the road to a free religion of the spirit.

The work done by the prophets seemed to be undone by the scribes, who bound the people with the law, as the Priests had done

with the ceremonial system; so that when Jesus came he found religion petrified into legalism. His attitude is, of course, well known. With voice more insistent than that of the prophets, a voice never again to be stilled in the world, he proclaimed the truth that religion is of the Spirit. Unless a man is born of the Spirit he can not see the Kingdom of God. All that a man needs in order to have eternal life is to come through him into touch with the Father whom he revealed. His most bitter accusations were directed against the Scribes and Pharisees, who kept the letter of the law, tithed mint and anise and cummin, and left undone the weightier matters of the law, Justice and Mercy. He brushed aside the whole system of legalism, with its elaborate ceremonies and ritual, and substituted two simple ordinances of symbolic rather than sacerdotal import, in his attitude even to these making it evident that they were free expressions of the Spiritual Life. But the old bondage of the letter was not so easily killed; and the lasting glory of the great apostle who followed the Master is that he finally emancipated Christianity from ceremonial bondage and sent it forward in the course of freedom. I like it not, he said, in substance, to those to whom he wrote, that you are still in bondage to feast days and Sabbath days and ritualistic observances. Why are you so soon departing, he asks of the Galatians, from the gospel that I preached unto you? Received ye the spirit by the works of the law or by hearing of faith? Having begun in the Spirit, are ye now perfected in the flesh? And to the Romans the message was the same: "We are justified by Faith"; and the whole transaction is in the free realm of the Spirit. "The letter killeth, it is the Spirit that giveth life." It is impossible to conceive of Paul's gospel as having in it any place for ordinances without which man would find it impossible to live the life of Faith.

The conditions under which Paul lived were remarkably reproduced in the days of Martin Luther, and the old conflict between a religion of ordinances and a religion of spiritual freedom was once more repeated. The history is too familiar to you all to require more than a passing reference. The simple ordinances of Jesus had been converted into the sacerdotal sacraments of the church, upon participation in which salvation was absolutely conditioned, and ecclesiastical ceremonialism had been bound with adamant chains upon the hearts of hopeless men. The old hero of the Reformation raised again the gospel cry of the great apostle whose mantle had

fallen upon him—"The just shall live by Faith." The Spirit of the modern world has taken up that refrain and made it its own, so that to-day throughout Protestant countries everywhere the free religion of the Spirit has triumphed and come into its own. However much religion may express itself in ordinances or use them for its ends, it must forever be unfettered by them, and in the last analysis is independent of them. Ordinances are not essential to religion.

What, then, we ask, is their legitimate function, if, indeed, they have any? The answer to this question is found in the fact that, while religion is a matter of the Spirit, it must domicile on earth if man is to have a share in it. It must have "a local habitation and a name." Man is a strange creature, living forever a dual life. He proudly lifts his head into the free air of heaven, but his lagging feet must tread the earth, and he lives in a house of clay. Even his most lofty ideals must be given embodiment in commonplace materials of earth if they are to have any real share in his life and help on the progress of civilization. Religion, therefore, even though in its nature it be spiritually free, must find earthly expression in the language and life of men; and herein is discovered the significance and value of religious ordinances.

Ordinances are the symbolic earthly expression of eternal religious truth. As such they perform a twofold function: they serve, on the one hand, as a means for the revelation of religious truth, and, on the other hand, as an aid to man's apprehension of that truth.

In illustration of this let us go back again to the old Hebrew Temple worship, which may be taken as the best type of the ceremonial system among all ancient peoples. We can see many ways in which the ordinances, in the large sense of the term, served as a means for the revelation of God's thought. In early times, to have said that God was everywhere, and that all places were equally holy, would have meant practically, for the man struggling upward into the religious consciousness, that God was nowhere, and that all places were equally profane. To have said that all times and seasons were equally sacred would have meant that there were no sacred times. To have declared that all acts were equally religious would have meant that all acts were irreligious. The temple with its holy of holies where God dwelt on earth, with its Sabbath days and festal days that God had consecrated, with its acts and ceremonies of worship that had special religious emphasis and signifi-



cance, God used as a starting-point for that long process of the revelation of himself, that at last makes the whole earth sacred, all times and seasons holy, and all the activities of man equally religious. And yet we still may well pity the man who has no holy places on earth. We still must be on our guard lest, in saying that every day is as sacred as the Sabbath day, the Sabbath day becomes simply an every day, and in insisting that all acts are equally religious, we make all life common and profane. Concerning the sacrifices, also, whether we can fully enter into the ancient feeling with reference to them or not, this much we must certainly recognize: that the sacrifice did not express the conviction of God's holy nature, his condemnation of sin, and the disastrous consequences of sin.

If we turn to the other aspect of ordinances, their assistance to the man reaching up after religious truth and life, their value is apparent. The ordination of circumcision incorporated a man into the community which was the object of God's special love and care, the people of the covenant, and gave him a share in its glorious past and its prophetic future. The religious feasts and festivals, the holy places and sacred ceremonies, lifted him upon the community tidal wave into the atmosphere of worship. Indeed, it is probable that these ceremonies of social communion were conceived of as shared in by God himself along with his people. And as men stood beside the burning sacrifice, feeling after God if haply they might find him in the unknown darkness, the ascending incense seemed to bear their prayers more quickly to his ears, and the death of the victim on which their sins had been placed diverted his wrath from them and left them free to come into his presence unafraid. The ordinances thus served as material stepping-stones to God.

Turning now to Christianity, why should the ancient elaborate ceremonialism be superseded by the two simple rites of baptism and the Lord's Supper? It may be answered, as Augustine answered, that numerous ordinances become a burden. He says that the old covenant had many such signs, and that the wisdom of our Saviour was shown in this: that he selected two simple ordinances, easy to be practiced, as sufficient for all of his followers. But we will find in these all that was of value in the ancient elaborate ritual, and more. The ordinance of baptism marks the entrance into the Christian community—that community which has been given the endearing name of the bride of Christ. But it does more than this: by its very form it symbolizes the new creation that has taken place in the

soul, that the old life is dead and buried, that there has been a spiritual renewal and resurrection, which brings a man into the joyous life of companionship with Christ, and through him into that touch with God which assures eternal life and the resurrection from the dead. But, still more, there is symbolized the fact that this man who has been plunged beneath the water and raised up out of it has experienced a cleansing from sin, which puts upon him the most sacred obligation to live henceforth the sort of life the Master lived whose name he now bears. The ordinance of baptism is in itself a most effective setting forth of these great truths, which are basal in Christianity, and serves, therefore, as an invaluable aid to the world in apprehending those truths.

The ordinance of the Lord's Supper is, if possible, even more beautiful, sacred and helpful. It sets forth in pictorial form the great fact of Christ's vicarious sacrifice for us. It is not the substance. In a true sense Christ's death itself is the great ordinance that sums up and infinitely fulfills all that there was of religious value in the ancient sacrificial system. The Lord's Supper is simply the memorial of this. This do, he says, in remembrance of me. What more beautiful or touching symbolic expression could be found of the world-wide truth that, in order to reach out a saving hand that shall really help, there must be back of it the vicarious giving of the life, and that this principle has found its universal incarnate manifestation in the breaking of the body and the shedding of the blood of the Son of man? And for the purpose of inculcating in us a realization of our privilege and obligation to share this spirit what means could be devised that would approach in effectiveness the call to the followers of Jesus to meet as his corporate body and enter into the tender memories of his death for us and for the world?

But the Lord's Supper is not merely a memorial; it is also a communion. We are reminded in every observance that our sustenance is to be found in Christ. We are to eat his body and drink his blood. The Spirit that was his is ours also. In this aspect of the Lord's Supper we have, intensified, the same religious value that was expressed in the ancient communal feasts between God and men. It seems probable that we as Baptists, in emphasizing this feature of the Lord's Supper, have not made adequate allowance for the thought, which a fair interpretation seems to involve, that this ordinance is also intended to express and encourage the

thought of the fellowship of believers one with another in the Lord, and so we have lost something of the social bond which unites the Master's followers into one fraternity.

The Lord's Supper has also a farther significance beyond that of a memorial and a communion. It is a prophecy: "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death *till he come.*" It is not my present purpose to enter into any discussion of the vexed question of the second coming of Christ. I only wish to call attention to the fact that the ordinance of the Lord's Supper places the golden age of humanity in the future, and declares that it is to be brought about by the coming of the Son of man in personal spiritual power. Toward this consummation the eyes of all earnest men longingly turn; and in the conviction that the progress of the Kingdom of God upon earth is dependent upon such a coming or comings of the Christ, I believe the hearts of earnest men are increasingly agreed. The nineteenth century witnessed an unprecedented development of the world's body and mind. The crisis that now confronts us is the problem whether this greater life of the world is to be infused with, and dominated by, the larger Spiritual presence and power of the Christ. We might as well hope to move one of the modern ocean leviathans across the seas with the engine of Robert Fulton's boat of a hundred years ago, and have it still fulfill the requirements of modern commerce, as to expect to move the great new world with the Spiritual power of a century ago. The power of Fulton's engines has been multiplied nearly two-thousandfold. The hope of the world to-day lies in a new coming of the Christ, that shall bring to a halting church, and through it to the famishing world, a wealth of spiritual power commensurate with its magnificent new material and intellectual equipment. The Lord's Supper is a prophecy of this glorious coming day.

But Canon Fremantle asks a question which is in some of your minds to-night, with reference to the permanent validity of the ordinances, and makes suggestions in reply that are so pertinent and valuable that I must quote them to you:

"It may be asked," he says, "whether such symbols as the sacraments have not had their day. They abounded in the Jewish dispensation, they abounded in the Middle Ages, and in each case they became a yoke which men were unable to bear. Are they not out of place in a modern and progressive era? Is not this the age of the Spirit and the time for plain speaking? Is not such plain speak-

ing especially the need of the new democracy? I would here draw your attention to a fact of the utmost importance, though often unrecognized, both in the sphere of worship and in that of life. It is this: that human nature is not merely rational and moved by appeals and arguments which are made by word of mouth. It is directed largely by instinct, which goes out into habit and is fed by habit in return; which works by unconscious or half-conscious impulses; which is fostered by training rather than by teaching; which is increased by impressions from without more than by conscious thought. Our Lord, while in his public teaching he constantly appeals to the reasoning faculty and bids men judge of themselves what is right, yet, in the institution of the church and the sacraments, recognizes the other element, the unconscious or instinctive side of human nature, that in which we are subject to training, to habit, to social forces, to impressions. In our Christian worship both these elements have their part. The Eastern churches trust almost entirely to the ceremonial influences. The Protestant churches have relied, perhaps too exclusively, on the appeal to the conscious reason." The chief value and the lasting utility of the Christian ordinances is that by means of an almost perfect symbolism they reinforce the rational teaching of the fundamental truths of Christianity. This value is no less real from the fact that their influence, instead of being exercised directly, bears likewise upon the unconscious, or sub-conscious, or supra-conscious self.

From what has been said about the function of ordinances there follow two corollaries: First, the over-emphasis of ordinances in religion tends toward the mechanical and the formal. Just as the danger in making images of the God lies in the worship of the image instead of the God, and leads to idolatry, so also it is possible to put so much emphasis upon the ordinances as to substitute the symbol for the reality symbolized and obscure the life which they are intended to express and foster. Secondly, the under-emphasis of the ordinances is in danger of encouraging a subjective sentimentalism that is indefinite and ineffective, and that hesitates to give to itself any expression whatever. There are certain cults current at the present day which owe their popularity in no small measure to this vague mysticism. There are thousands of men and women, nominally Christian, whose religious life would gain tremendously in meaning and virility if they could be induced to face the issue squarely and commit themselves definitely to the Christian cause.

The proper emphasis of the Christian ordinances may be made of untold value to them in this very respect.

In conclusion, a few words will perhaps be expected, and may not be out of place, with reference to the historical authority of the Christian ordinances. Can it be proved that they were established by the founder of Christianity? Their simplicity and saneness, their unsacerdotal and spiritual character, their beautiful adaptability to the ends for which they were established, are unquestionably in favor of that view. The historical documents taken at their face value lead to the same conclusion. And historical criticism has not disproved it, to say the least. But, in any case, who has a right to affirm that the value of an idea depends upon our ability to chase it back through the historical labyrinth of the centuries to its ancient source? The permanent validity of the ordinances of Christianity does not rest upon the question of their origin alone, but upon their worth as adequate symbolic expressions of Christian truth, and upon their utility in keeping man in touch with God. Far be it from me to minimize the value to religion of the intellectual and the critical. The ship of Christianity must have the intellectual rudder, or it will wreck upon the rocks. But of what avail is the rudder if the unquenchable fires are not burning deep down in the heart of the ship, and if the solid shaft of steel does not keep unbroken the all-important connection with the propeller? Have we not been in danger of not merely steering the ship with the rudder, but of trying by this means also to make it go? Calvinism and Unitarianism and higher criticism all belong to the same genus: they are only varieties of intellectualism—of the head, heady, all of them. Uneasy bedfellows, but bedfellows nevertheless. I am profoundly convinced that the Church needs to-day a new definition of orthodoxy that will place the test where Jesus puts it, in the disposition and the will; that will regard as orthodox not so much the man who holds true theories about the origin of the sun and the nature of light as the one who takes the right attitude toward the sun and uses its light that in it he may live his life with joy and do his work with success. In this new orthodoxy the ordinances of Christianity will have a secure place because of their sure religious worth. If the Church were without ordinances, it would be forced forthwith to produce them, or would not long survive as an organized entity. The Church ought, therefore, to be profoundly grateful that it has these two ordinances of such matchless simplicity and beauty, so

perfectly symbolizing the fundamental facts and truths of Christianity, and having historic associations reaching back to the days of the apostles, and understood by them to be authorized by Christ himself—ordinances that serve as a bond of unity for Christendom, and as a religious agency of incalculable worth in maintaining the *esprit de corps* of the local church and in binding the soul of the disciple to that of the Master.

In conclusion, we will not be far wrong if we think of Jesus as saying of our Christian ordinances, and, indeed, of all ordinances, what he said of one of the chief belonging to the Jewish dispensation: The ordinances were made for man, and not man for the ordinances. The Son of man is Lord also of the ordinances. With this in mind, we will not interject them between man and God, and claim a place for them to which they have no right; but, believing that they *are* made for man, the Church will use them as legitimate and helpful agencies for bodying forth to a world of sense the truths of the Spirit, and for aiding men through the symbol which is seen to rise into the presence of him who is invisible and eternal.

THE PRESIDENT: The first appointed speaker is the Rev. J. A. Herrick, Ph.D., of Bay City, Mich.

REV. J. A. HERRICK, Ph.D., Bay City, Mich.:

Religion may be defined as a belief binding a man to a Being on whom he is conscious that he is dependent; also the life that springs out of the recognition of this relation, including duties, experience, doctrines and rites founded upon it. But such religion affects the whole personality of man, and may be resolved into a threefold activity: The Emotional, expressing itself in worship; the Intellectual, expressing itself in doctrine; the Volitional, expressing itself in works. Worship is the emotional expression of religion; feeling finding utterance in music, art, architecture, prayer, praise, penitence, petition, rites and ceremonies.

Doctrine is the intellectual expression of the religious value of God, self, the world and the work of redemption. Works or missions are the expression in conduct of the duty-feeling arising from the religious apprehension of great ideals; the incarnation of the will in conduct and character. We may define an ordinance as a religious rite or ceremony, established by custom or authority.

In answering the question, What is the function of ordinances in religion, we shall confine ourselves to the Christian religion and the two ordinances common to Catholic and Protestant faith. Now, definitely stated, therefore, the discussion will deal with the function of Baptism and the Lord's Supper in the Christian religion. The historical development of the subject has passed through three stages:

I. The primitive stage of the apostolic period when Christianity was personal and free.

II. The development of Christianity into a metaphysical authority religion.

III. The modern stage of Christianity as a religion of personality and freedom.

We shall consider all three stages of the development in order.

I. The function of ordinances in primitive Christianity.

Christianity entered the world in the person of an individual, Jesus Christ, who from his observation and inward experience proclaimed God a Father of love and forgiving grace. He called men to him to learn of him the secret of eternal life, and revealed it to them as trust in a loving Father and loyal endeavor to do his will. The disciples after his death continued the teaching of his message and the living of his life. A society sprang up having two sacred rites, baptism and the Lord's Supper.

That Jesus instituted the ordinance of baptism is not certain. There is serious doubt of the genuineness of Matt. 28: 19, as a saying of Jesus; it is only a very late stage of the tradition that represents Jesus as delivering speeches and giving commandments, and the Trinitarian formula is foreign to the life of Jesus and has not the authority of the apostolic age. On the other hand, in Paul's time Gentile and Jewish Christians were baptized, and by immersion. We may assume that although Jesus himself baptized not, he received the ordinance from John and it passed on as a universal practice of the early Church. Its meaning found expression in its formulas, "baptized unto the remission of sins" and "unto the name of Jesus." "Unto" probably means that the person baptized was declared put into relation first with the fact of forgiveness, then into relation with and dependence upon the person of Jesus, unto whose name he was baptized. Paul relates baptism to the death of Jesus, which, being

the expression of forgiving grace, means the same thing as "unto forgiveness," and declares the person baptized to have passed into the relation of a forgiven sinner. The new life kindled by the person of Jesus is maintained by being in connection with him, which connection and dependence, as set forth in baptism "unto his name," Paul expresses when he declares, "I can do all things through Christ who strengtheneth me," and "I live, and yet not I, but Christ liveth in me."

The "Lord's Supper" Jesus taught his disciples to observe, and in the broken bread to think of his surrender of life in loving sympathy for all men; and in the drinking of the cup, of his death as for the remission of sins; and that they should remember these things forever. So now the account in Mark 10: 45; Paul also, in his account, emphasizes the saving significance of the death of Christ for the forgiveness of sins, as set forth in the symbolical ordinance of the Supper, based on Ex. 24: 3, which Jesus instituted in order that the disciples, by repeating it in accordance with his will, might be the more deeply impressed by it. Some doubt is raised concerning the primacy of Paul's tradition of the meaning of the Supper; and this doubt rests upon the discourse in John 6th, the Supper prayer in the Didache, and the account in Mark, all of which represent the Supper as the symbol of the communication of eternal life, in feeding upon the spiritual body and blood of Jesus, and an anticipation of future existence. Zahn has strengthened this notion in declaring that Jesus did not institute the Supper any more than he did baptism, but that he took a certain custom ready to hand and celebrated it, viz., the Messianic meal, which anticipated, in symbolic form, triumph over death, the perfection of the Messianic work, and the filling of believers with the power of the eternal kingdom and life; the reference to the passover of the death of Christ being a later, but still quite early, development.

The main thing for us to consider is not, however, the question as to which view is correct; our interest lies in the fact that both ordinances were purely symbolized and both represented spiritual truths and their function was purely pedagogic. Their pedagogic functions were:

1. *In relation to the subject*; to deepen the realization of his relation to God as a forgiven sinner; his relation to Christ, as dependent upon him, by a symbolic external expression of these experiences in baptism; and in the Supper, to quicken his memory of



one whose life of suffering, ending in death, was a victory, a passing over to glory in which he still lives, the giver of the eternal life and power to those who live his life after him.

2. *Relative to the world*; the pedagogic value of the ordinances lay in the testimony to the great facts of forgiveness of sin, and dependence upon Christ conferred in baptism, and the declaration of eternal life and the power of the life to come as set forth in the observance of the Lord's Supper.

As such they were at once an act of feeling, of worship, expressing gratitude, dependence and joy; a satisfaction to the intellect as it set forth the ideas of forgiveness and eternal life; an act of the will, being obedience to the command of Jesus and a testimony to the world. In the beginning, therefore, before Christianity was formulated as a world-religion, while it was yet a spiritual faith in God and personal allegiance to Jesus, the function of its ordinances was purely pedagogical: teaching and perpetuating the memory of historical facts and spiritual experience.

II. The function of ordinances in Christianity secularized in terms of Greek philosophy and science.

Inside of three hundred years after the death of Jesus the gospel of grace and a holy life had become a Christian philosophy of the universe; the spiritual had become mysterious, the ethical metaphysical, and it made its proud way among the wise as the supreme philosophy, at once supported by, and supporting, the ancient mysteries and philosophies. Christianity the religion of free spiritual personal life, heaven the authoritative source of wisdom and salvation, and the Church the mediator of both.

The presuppositions of Christianity as an authority religion are twofold: the Ptolemaic astronomy and the Platonic philosophy.

1. The Ptolemaic astronomy: To the thinker of the time the earth was the center of the universe; heaven stretched above and hell beneath. The planets and sun revolved around the earth. This scientific view of the universe lies back of the writing of both testaments, the discussion of the fathers and the arguments of the apologists. In its most elaborate form it was worked out by Diogenes, Peter Lombard, Thomas Aquinas and Dante. Dante pictured the empyrean and the concerted heavens, paradise, purgatory and hell; the triune God seated upon his throne upon the arch of the heavens, as real as the Pope in the chair of St. Peter; the seraphim and cherubim surrounding the Almighty, as real as the cardinals the

Pope; the three great orders of Angels corresponding to the three orders of Bishops, Priests and Deacons.

God in the tenth heaven, whence through principalities and powers, cherubim and seraphim, he was praised and carried out his will upon earth; and hell beneath, ruled by Lucifer and filled with evil spirits, which escaped and roamed about doing damage to men and beasts, the cause of sin and suffering—such was the Christian view of the universe riveted to the Ptolemaic astronomy by biblical texts, and declared authorities that for all time.

Under this scientific scheme, with a God outside of the world, a heaven above, a hell beneath, revelation was conceived as an external act, something let down from heaven; ascents to heaven, descents to hell occurred, and grace came to be something from *outside* of the world, supernatural and miraculous.

2. The Platonic philosophy: Added to the Ptolemaic view of the world were the fundamental principles of Greek philosophy:

(a). The psychology of the period, which taught that the outer creates the inner life; the correspondence of the physical and natural, environment and subject, world and man. Life rests upon the impressions made upon the soul; thought aroused by physical impressions, and dependent upon impression for its life. Therefore there was necessary a sensible element to complete a thought and act. A contract for a bargain; a ruler to embody the idea of the State; legal business must be sharply defined by an act—some sensible thing was necessary to embody an idea. So, logically, religion is expressed in a church; divine revelation in written documents; divine grace through physical elements, upon all of which the soul is dependent for its salvation.

(b). Also the Platonic doctrine of substance as the essence of things: God a substance with attributes; the world a substance with qualities; the soul a substance with faculties. This substance was something fixed—changeless, static. Every experience and act of man was related to a substance—personality was a substance. Then, too, the powers that excite the personal are world-ruling agencies; therefore theology became the study of a God substance, which all his attributes inhere; psychology became the study of a soul substance in which faculties inhere. Religion was a communion between man, a personal substance, and God a personal substance outside of him. Redemption became the impartation of the divine soul substance to the human soul substance, the superhuman to the

human; the divine to the natural. Out of the conception of world, soul, and God as static substance, grew the notion of static authoritative tradition, knowledge, necessary to salvation work; and Christianity, the source of the authoritative knowledge of God in a world where the fixed and changeless were regarded as authoritative in science, morality and religion, became the absolute religion. Out of the belief that spiritual experiences, graces and authority must have an external or physical expression arose the supernatural church, the physical guarantee of spiritual blessings, the authority for revelation, salvation and truth. It was a supernatural city of God. Monks and nuns became representative of supernatural authoritative virtue; theologians became bearers of supernatural revealed knowledge; bishops became bearers of supernatural authority; and priests became bearers of supernatural sacramental work. Thus the mediæval Church upon the ground of the old Ptolemaic astronomy and Platonic philosophy built a second world above the natural world, and held the keys to it.

With these presuppositions in the minds of Christian theologians it is not at all surprising that the religion of Jesus supported by faith and the personal attraction of himself should have lost its path and come to be a religion based upon authority exactly like the old world religions. Nor need we be surprised to find the ordinances taking on the magical character of the mysteries of the ancient authority.

The development is as follows:

Spiritual worship is realized in certain definite institutions: *a.* Discipline. *b.* Baptism. *c.* Fasting and prayer. *d.* Lord's Supper. The ordinances came to be regarded as mysterious: God-produced, rather than natural. Up to the year 150 baptism was naïvely considered a bath of regeneration, a renewal of life, the blotting out of past sins. But as faith was still the necessary condition of forgiveness, and God regarded as a forgiving God, the real significance of baptism was uncertain. Its effect on the past was problematic, but it imposed certain vows hard to keep. *Up to this time there is no such thing as infant baptism.* Later baptism was regarded as "seal," "enlightenment"—two Greek ideas, the one implying as "seal" the guarantee of a blessing, the other some mysterious effect not the same as the gift of the Spirit spoken of in Acts, which phenomenon disappeared very early in the history of the Church.

The full development of the doctrine of baptism is found in

principle as early as the third century, when it was considered an expiation for sins, a means of grace necessary to salvation. By it the spiritual act of regeneration is accomplished by an external act; the grace of the upper world, the God outside of man is mediated to the lower world, the soul inside of man. Infants were baptized to be saved, and the metamorphosis of a simple ordinance with a purely spiritual significance into a Greek mystery with magical effect is complete.

The Lord's Supper experienced a similar development. The Jewish idea of worship as a spiritual sacrifice was interpreted by Paul (Romans 12) as a spiritual offering of the heart and life in obedience to God. Soon prayers offered in public worship and gifts to the poor taken from the material of the Lord's Supper were a part of this sacrifice. Next the idea of sacrifice ruled the whole worship and appeared in a special manner in the Lord's Supper, and gave that ordinance a new and entirely Greek meaning, in which the sacrifice of the Church in its observance became entirely dissociated from the sacrifice of Jesus on the cross. The celebration of the Lord's Supper came to be the central point in the life of the Church. It was enriched with a wealth of Old Testament idea entirely foreign to its idea as a memorial. It became the Eucharist, the joyful sacrifice of the community, and held a double significance. First, it placed before God what the community had received from him, to receive it back with thanks and praise. Second, as the elements stood for the body and blood of Jesus, they communicated God, became a gift of salvation; but, as salvation was still considered as purely spiritual—*i. e.*, faith, knowledge and eternal life, and the elements were esteemed only the mysterious vehicles of these blessings.

This was the development at the time of Justin Martyr. The third century finds the Supper transformed, as was baptism, into a mystery effecting a real bodily communication of Jesus. The substance of God enters the substance of man as incorruption enters corruption; it is "medicine of immortality," the sustenance of eternal life. The bread is the real body, the wine the real blood of Jesus; the Lord's Supper the progressive incarnation of Jesus, those partaking it changing their mortal bodies into the resurrection body of Jesus. Thus the Supper became at once the Church's offering of the body and blood of Jesus as a perpetual sacrifice, nullifying the sacrifice of Jesus on the cross, which was to end all sacrifice,

but reminding God of his sacrifice, in order to guarantee the effects of sacrifice to the Church; also a communication of this very benefit of salvation and immortality through the body and blood of Jesus to those who ate. Child communion was instituted as the logical complement of child baptism, and the metamorphosis of the Lord's Supper, as a simple memorial, into a full-fledged Greek mystery, with the magical effect of bringing God down and into man, is accomplished.

The function of ordinances in authority religion is a logical and necessary outgrowth of the science and philosophy of the time. The Church became the City of God on earth; the Pope God in her midst; salvation hers to dispense—all were lost outside of her pale; those saved submitting themselves to her to have themselves filled with holy concentration as with food, and the instruments of this feeding process the ordinances whose function was the mysterious, miraculous, magical communication of forgiveness and eternal life.

III. The function of Ordinances in Christianity as the religion of the free moral conscience in a modern world.

The emergence of Christianity as a spiritual religion of free moral personality from the bonds of authoritative church, priest and book and magical agents is comprehensible only in view of the new science and philosophy that have washed away the old supports of authority religion. In indicating the change in world thought, which has emancipated Christianity, we will do well to trace briefly the great reactions against authority which took place in the Renaissance and Reformation and by which man came to his rights as a free personality.

The individualism of the Latin cities developed the free individual life by their local peculiarities and political self-dependence. Then in political and social struggles individualism arises and man asserts his right to realize his endowment by the development of his energies. Also, the crusaders who invaded the Orient in the name of Orthodoxy came back with burdens of heresy, and the wider vision resulted in more freedom and individualism. But the prime factor in the rediscovery of the value of the human compared with the superhuman was the return to the literature of antiquity, with its history, poetry and philosophy, which revealed to men that outside of the Church was a human life of intellectual power, following its own law and confident of its own power to judge and discover truth.

Life in the Reformation was a discovery that outside of the Church existed the sources of spiritual life. The Reformation called men from the Catholic tradition to the biblical. The Renaissance called men from scholasticism to Greek and Roman literature. In both cases there was a return from the derived to the original; from the traditional to the sources. In doing this both broke the yoke of authority and proclaimed the freedom of the human spirit which manifested itself *first* in the *independent choice of authorities*, and second, in the free criticism and investigation of all knowledge by science, and the grounds of personal faith by religion. Certainty of knowledge has come to be the result of personal research; certainty of the spiritual life has come to be the personal experience, and external authority of all kinds has disappeared forever. Thus have the old doctrines of Church and World lost meaning and the old guarantees have lost authority.

Now, the old guarantee of knowledge and salvation was super-human, the new distinctly human; the old guarantee rested upon disesteem of nature, the new upon regard for the human; the old upon distrust of personality, the new upon the abiding truth of the inner life. With this emphasis upon the value of the human, and the primacy of personal life, the authority of scholasticism and the church was abolished. Salvation was realized, not through any authentic miracle-working church, but by personal faith in a spiritual God.

2. Added to this discovery of freedom is the supplanting of the Ptolemaic astronomy by the Copernican, the discovery of the heliocentric theory of the universe. Men were taught to lift their eyes from the confines of earth to a boundless universe. The old maps of heaven and hell were destroyed; the old notions of upper world and lower world grew childish, and the ancient antithesis between heaven and earth gave place to a new unity. The effect upon the old guarantees of religion was radical. The program of redemption accomplished in four thousand years between Eden and Olivet came to be too small; ascents into heaven and descents into hell must be interpreted symbolically. Revelation as an external act between heaven and earth gives place to revelation as a spiritual process in the heart of man; no longer authoritative external law, but divine self-expression in human experiences. Heaven no longer a locality, but an ideal; not a place, but a value. The result is that the whole structure of the church falls, and with it all authority of

Priest, Bishop and Book. The supernatural is no longer outside of man, but inside. God no longer an external First Cause, but an immanent Spirit working endlessly in self-communication. "My Father worketh hitherto." Hence, grace and salvation are not something non-human, external, outside of the world, to be mediated by dogmas or sacraments, but something working directly in the human heart, independent and free from all external agencies. Thus God has become a greater God, and salvation is set free from all fetters of authority and external forms of sacraments and dogmas, revelation emancipated from a fixed content of the past, and God revealed in all space and all time; the God of the living as well as the dead, manifesting himself in history, in his Son and in the living present.

The significance of the whole modern movement may be summarized as follows: The category of substance has been displaced by that of spirit; being by becoming; force by ideal; spirit has been freed from matter; authority has abdicated to moral consciousness; theology has become the interpretation of God's becoming, rather than his static substance; psychology the interpretation of progressive experience, rather than a soul substance.

The significance of this movement is immense; it has created a new valuation of the Bible, a new valuation of the Church, and a new valuation of the ordinances.

What, in view of the changed view of the universe and spiritual life, is the function of ordinances?

1. Negatively. From our discussion certain negative conclusions are inevitable:

(a). Ordinances can no longer be regarded as capable of imparting spiritual benefits necessary to salvation.

Baptism has lost its power to save. It can confer no grace of divine forgiveness, nor can it regenerate the soul.

The functions of baptism were logical enough under the old Greek system, but now they are ridiculous. God is no longer outside the world, compelled to affect the soul through a miracle-working church. God is no longer static substance, depending upon a miracle to impart himself to the soul substance. The spirit is no longer dependent upon the physical, the inward upon the outward to realize itself; a God immediate in the soul, realizing himself in the soul, through the soul's willingness to obey him, has taken the place of the old Greek thought; grace has become independent of

external forces, and baptism has lost its miraculous effect. Infant baptism, a logical and inevitable inference from the Greek philosophy of the Middle Ages, has lost its justification and the return to the gospel has been made.

Likewise the Lord's Supper has lost its miraculous significance.

It is no longer a sacrifice of the community, for Jesus did to the death the whole system of sacrifice in his revelation of God as a being of love, eternally forgiving, needing not to be appeased by blood or gifts.

Neither is it a sacrament communicating certain spiritual benefits. The presuppositions for such a function are gone. God is not apart from men needing to be mediated; God is not substance that can be communicated or assimilated. Redemption is no longer confined to an act in the past. God is immanent—in the soul and in the world: God is a spirit, a great ideal to be appropriated and obeyed by an act of the moral will. Redemption is a constant process. God loves, God forgives, God sanctifies, and the process takes place through the one that thinks and feels and wills, and not through ordinances of any character. Now also disappears child communion, the logical complement of child baptism, both being a survival of Greek mystery, based on Greek thought.

Positively. What, then, is the positive function of ordinances in Christianity? First, let us define Christianity: it is faith in the God of love and truth revealed by Jesus Christ, and the moral acts of obedience, which grow out of a desire to be like him. By faith I mean not intellectual assent, but a response of the soul to Jesus Christ in which the ideal presented in Jesus is recognized, and deeply and truly made ours by a definite act of the will.

Such faith was kindled primarily by the Person of Jesus, who embodied the ideal in his life and works. His life kindled the life of the disciples; they called him Lord and loved him, and expressed their love in loyal endeavor to reproduce the spirit of his life.

Since the death of Jesus faith has been kindled in exactly the same way, only the personality of Jesus has come to us in a different manner: first through the lives of men who are reproducing the spirit of his life, the constant incarnations of Jesus in quality, if not in quantity. This ideal of life is corrected and reinforced by the gospels, which contain the impression which his character made upon the first disciples, and to which they and all subsequent Christians point as the regulator and corrector of their lives. Finally, by



two ordinances, in which are preserved, as in a picture, two great facts—first, one of experience, and second, one of history. The function of these two ordinances is, therefore, to-day what it was to primitive Christianity—purely pedagogical. The Christian becomes a Christian in his soul's apprehension of a forgiving God, revealed in a Saviour who proclaimed that he revealed God's love in his death for his enemies; he remains a Christian in a whole-souled love for such a God as was revealed in Jesus, being dependent upon him and struggling to be like him. Baptism, therefore, has a double pedagogic significance: 1. *To the believer*; in that it is a form in which what are already facts are expressed. These facts are, first, an experience of forgiveness: "unto forgiveness"; second, dependence upon and relation to Jesus: "unto the name of Jesus." 2. *To the world*; in that first it testifies to the believer's faith in a forgiving God; second, to his personal trust and dependence upon him. Likewise the Lord's Supper—its function, purely pedagogic, is, first: *To the believer*, in that it helps him to keep fresh in his heart the memory and the confidence of faith in a life that knew no death. Second: *To the world*, in that it is a recurrent testimony to the love of God manifested in the life and death of his Son, and the Christian's faith in eternal life.

Both ordinances are tender and blessed, associated with what is sweetest and deepest in Christian life—the obligation to observe them resting not upon the outward command, not in their saving efficiency, but upon their value as helps to the realization of the love that passes understanding, and the deep, earnest desire to keep ever before the world, in ways sanctioned by Jesus, our dear Lord and Saviour, the great saving truths of Christianity.

(Especial indebtedness is acknowledged to Dr. Foster's "Finality of the Christian Religion" and Harnack's "History of Dogma.")

THE PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the Rev. E. A. Hanley, D.D., of Cleveland, O.

REV. E. A. HANLEY, D.D.: *Mr. President*: I can truthfully say that it gives me anything but pleasure to speak on this occasion and upon this subject. And I may say as frankly that, perhaps, before I am through you may be able to reciprocate my feeling. I should have declined the courteous invitation of the Congress to speak on this subject could I have done so without cowardice. And even now I should refrain from speaking my whole mind were such pos-

sible without dissimulation. I am deeply sensitive of the pain my words must give, but in simple loyalty to the truth I cannot do otherwise. May God help me to speak and help you to hear.

Whether the committee in charge meant to conceal the real issue or to muzzle the speakers, I know not; but of one thing I am certain: there can be no pronouncement upon the function of the ordinances until we have passed upon the previous question of their authority. There are two fundamental views. According to one, the ordinances are commanded by our Lord and Master, and are therefore binding upon all his followers. According to the other, they are merely human customs, which were taken up by the Church; they are without divine authority, and, though more or less helpful, can not be held as obligatory upon those who follow Jesus Christ. In view of these radically different conceptions, we can not know how to estimate the function; we can not know how to estimate the function of the ordinances until first we have answered the question as to whether or not they have back of them divine authority.

I feel like congratulating the papers of the evening and the Speaker upon their successful avoidance of this dangerous question. With all the spiritual interest of this discussion, and with much that has been said, I am in hearty accord; but, in my judgment, the vital issue has not been squarely met. The first paper of the evening says that ordinances are rites imposed by Divine authority, and then assumes that the Christian ordinances were so imposed. But when it comes to a Divine command, which is understood as binding upon the human conscience, we have no right to assume; it is our most sacred duty to investigate, and to be certain of our ground. The second paper, after speaking of the spiritual value of the ordinances, asks whether Jesus commanded them, and then says: "Historical criticism has not disproved it." If this question is to be asked seriously, it should be central in the discussion, rather than an addendum at the close. But, even so, does the paper mean to imply that historical criticism *might* disprove the authority for the ordinances? In other words, is that authority of such a nature as to depend at all upon the results of criticism? Then to your tents, O Israel! For an authority that can possibly be set aside by historical criticism is no spiritual authority whatever. And when the paper finally says that the validity of the ordinances depends upon their utility, it has in reality abandoned an authoritative position.

By the term "ordinances" I understand baptism and the Lord's Supper. In the time allotted I can speak only of baptism, and I wish to consider it as a *required ordinance*. However, that which is said of one ordinance as required will apply in principle to the other likewise.

My practical experience in the ministry has forced me into the consideration of this whole subject. I have baptized people who came forth from the watery grave with something of Divine glory upon their faces. After careful instruction, I have baptized others, who were naturally so shrinking and timid, and so worked up nervously, that, had I not held them by physical force, they would have collapsed before the audience. It is my candid judgment that, on account of timidity and nervousness, they did not have sufficient composure of mind to observe this ordinance intelligently. Christian men have come to me and said: "I should like to unite with your church. I like the spirit, and it would be a joy to labor with you in Christian service. But I do not feel as you do about baptism. I regard baptism as a custom that was practiced in the early church, just as fasting and the holy kiss. I do not believe Jesus ever meant this ordinance to be imposed as a test of fellowship, and I can not submit to it in sincerity and truth." Others have said to me—men whose Christian spirit I could not impeach—that they would like to join my church. Questions regarding their faith brought assuring answers. Then I asked how they felt about baptism, and the reply came: "Of course I shall be baptized. I regard baptism as an initiation into the church, just as that required by any of the Orders. And if I join the Baptist Church I shall certainly be baptized."

Such actual experiences have driven me back to a fresh examination of the New Testament and Baptist history, and have compelled me to ask the question: *What right have we to say to men that they must be baptized before they can enter the fellowship of our church?* Do not misunderstand me—I am not trying to find a convenient way to increase the membership of my church. I have enough people already for whom I know not what to do. In all sincerity, the only motive that inspires me in this matter is the desire to be faithful to the Spirit of Christ. When we find ourselves at such variance with other Christians, it becomes us in all honesty to inquire what is the will of our Lord, and how we may faithfully represent Him to men.

Immediately the question becomes one of consistency with our own principles. The Baptist Church has stood in history for the eternal principle of soul liberty. We have said that every man must be free to interpret the commands of God as touching his own life, and free to perform his duty as he himself understands it. There can be no limitation upon his liberty, except such a perversion of it as would injure others. By common consent, men are agreed that no one can claim that as a liberty which naturally operates to another's hurt. Now the question arises, how can we, the historic witnesses to liberty of conscience, say to men that they must be baptized before they may enter our Christian fellowship?

But the question goes deeper than denominational consistency. It is ultimately a matter of fidelity to the mind and Spirit of Jesus Christ. We must go back to the New Testament and ask whether there is clear evidence that Jesus meant for us to require baptism of those who would follow Him. Until recently, the discussion of this ordinance has turned upon a fact of history. And we may truthfully say that the contest is closed. It is now a historic certainty that baptism in the New Testament was by immersion. But to-day the issue has shifted, and another question emerges, namely, Did Jesus command baptism at all? Is such a required ordinance in accord with His Spirit? And there should be no people more ready to examine the word of God than those who have hitherto appealed to its authority. Recently we saw the challenge sent by certain Congregational ministers to the editor of one of our denominational papers: "Did Jesus command baptism? Name chapter and verse"; and it is to be regretted that the answer was not so direct and incisive as the question. The time is rapidly coming when as Baptists we shall be called upon to state anew to the world the reason for our insistence upon a required ordinance. Our position is not different, so far as principle is concerned, from that of other churches; but the challenge will come to us first, inasmuch as our position is thought to be most pronounced and consistent. We have said to all men that they should go to the New Testament, and very soon we shall be met with the echo of our own words.

Many good men will feel that we are scandalized by opening our minds to such a question. They would say: "In what a sorry light would Baptists appear before the world if they stopped to ask such a question! Don't raise it—don't raise it; it will put us

to shame before men. It could only awaken doubt; and what if some should conclude that baptism was not authorized by Jesus Christ?" To all this I answer, It need not concern us what the world thinks. The only motive we have any right to entertain is faithfulness to our Lord by absolute loyalty to His truth, and devotion to the interests of His kingdom. There could be neither dishonor nor disloyalty in our asking this question; but, indeed, there may be both in our refusal to ask it.

But I deny that the raising of this question could in any way place us in an inconsistent attitude, even should we conclude at last that baptism as a required ordinance is not according to the mind of Christ. Along with our cry of soul liberty has gone that other watchword, loyalty to the Word of God. But, loyalty to whose interpretation of God's Word?—aye, there's the rub. Are we bound to maintain the interpretation of the early fathers, of Luther or Calvin? Do we obligate ourselves to maintain the imposition of hands as an ordinance requisite to fellowship, as was once advocated by Roger Williams? Nay; when we swear allegiance to the Word of God, we mean loyalty to that Word as its meaning shall be made plain to us from day to day. There has been a progressive interpretation of the will of God as revealed in sacred Scripture, and we must be loyal to the fullest light it has been our privilege to receive. If, therefore, the time should ever come when we should be assured from the New Testament that Jesus never intended baptism to be a required ordinance, our own principle of loyalty to the Word of God would require us to abandon a false position.

We dare not, I say, be deterred from a fresh examination of the Scriptures through fear of denominational scandal. On the other hand, we are driven to this investigation by the peril in which we stand of sacramentarianism. In our insistence upon baptism, have we not obscured some plain commands written large on every page of the New Testament? We have virtually said to men: "You must be baptized in order to belong to our Church, and you may bring up your children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; you must have part in the practical work of the Church and in sending the gospel unto the ends of the earth; you may regard yourselves as stewards of the wealth God has given you, but *you must be baptized.*" Where do we find any authority in the Word of God for thus making an ordinance a requisite to Christian fellowship, and at the same time, for leaving some of the greatest imperatives of

Jesus' teaching as optional matters? Not long hence we must give answer before the Christian world to the charge of sacramentarianism on account of this disproportionate emphasis. I believe it would be more nearly in accord with the mind of Christ for us to say: "If you would have fellowship in the Christian Church, you may be baptized, according to your own sense of duty; but the teaching and mind of Christ are so plain that you must bring up your children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; you must have part in our joint effort to save men and carry the gospel to the ends of the earth; you must, in this day of storm and strife, regard yourselves as stewards of the wealth God has given you—these things are such a vital part of discipleship that you must seek to do them, or you can not share the fellowship of a Christian Church." Thus we should put the emphasis where Jesus placed it, and we should lay down conditions which belong inseparably to the very nature of discipleship. Jesus nowhere said to any man: "You must be baptized or you can not be my disciple." But He did say to one man at least: "Sell all that thou hast, and distribute unto the poor—and come, follow me." And when the young ruler could not meet this condition Jesus allowed him to go away.

We are summoned by loyalty to the Word of God, by the spirit of brotherhood between all believers, and by our own sense of honor, to a closer examination of the teaching and Spirit of Jesus Christ. If Jesus has clearly required baptism of all believers, our position is not only right, but we are under obligation to strive with renewed zeal to win others from the error of their way. But if it is not clear that Jesus requires baptism of His disciples, we have assumed to lay a burden upon them; and thus we have not only misrepresented the mind of our Lord, but we are grievously sinning against the whole brotherhood of Christ.

I have tried to make a careful study of the New Testament on this subject, but it is possible at the present time only to indicate in a general way what seems to be its teaching. In the Gospels, the only clear reference of Jesus to Christian baptism is found in the Great Commission. Jesus Himself was baptized, just as He worshiped in the synagogue and attended the religious feasts of His people, for Jesus did not stand aloof from the religious activity of His own day. But in no case does He enjoin baptism upon any one of His followers. And, considering that for a time Jesus with His disciples continued John's baptism, that He frequently referred

to the work of John, and that He compared His own sufferings to a kind of baptism, it is surprising, indeed, that he made but a single reference to Christian baptism. If Jesus meant this ordinance to be required of all His followers, it is very remarkable that this should be His only reference to the subject, and that His command should be put in the form of a participle. Moreover, the solemn formula, "into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit," so far as the records of the New Testament show, was never employed by the Apostles in baptism. They used instead merely the name of Jesus Christ or the Lord Jesus. Now the question arises, if Jesus spoke these very words to His disciples, and they understood Him as giving a specific command, why did they change this sacred formula? There are those who hold that these words were written by a later hand, and were added to Matthew's Gospel, just as the last twelve verses of Mark were clearly added by another to Mark's Gospel. I do not feel competent to pass upon this question, but, to my mind, it is far from being certain that Jesus actually commanded baptism.

In the early church baptism was practiced immediately after Pentecost, and became universal. But it is especially significant that no one in the Acts or Epistles refers the practice back to a command of Christ. The thought of the Apostles does not seem to have been clear as to the meaning of baptism, and is not wholly free from a legalistic conception. Peter says, "Repent ye, and be baptized \* \* \* in the name of Jesus Christ *unto the remission of your sins*"; and he writes, "which also after a true likeness *doth now save you, even baptism*"; and Ananias says to Paul, "Arise, and be baptized, and *wash away thy sins*, calling on His name." We have not yet done justice to this plain language. It is hard to see how these words can mean anything more than that baptism was regarded as, in some sense, a condition to the forgiveness of sins. Again, we read words which look very much as if the church at Corinth had the custom of baptizing for the dead—clearly a pagan view of baptism. Again, Paul says that the Lord did not send him to baptize, but to preach the gospel. He had evidently received baptism as a custom of the church, but did not place any great value upon it. In the sixth chapter of Romans, and elsewhere, he refers to baptism for purposes of illustration; but he thus refers to baptism for the dead, in the fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians, and a command is no more implied in the one case than in the other. We must remember, also, that Christian baptism arose before there

was seen to be any opposition between Christianity and Judaism, and at a time when Christians believed they ought to observe the Jewish ordinances. And since baptism is nowhere referred to a command of Christ, may it not have been that in practicing this ordinance the early Christians regarded it from the Jewish point of view?

But the compromise between faith and legalism, seen especially in the fifteenth chapter of Acts, could not long endure. Sooner or later the issue had to be fought to a finish. There were those who held that no one could be a Christian unless he had been circumcised. In that critical hour Paul championed the freedom and sufficiency of faith. In his emancipation proclamation, the Epistle to the Galatians, Paul declared that faith in Jesus Christ had forever abolished the dominion of Jewish ordinances. He said: "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but faith working through love." But we can not help asking what is the difference, so far as principle is concerned, between saying that men must be circumcised in order to be disciples of Jesus Christ, and saying that they must be baptized before they can be admitted into the fellowship of the Christian Church? And if Paul said that neither circumcision nor uncircumcision availeth anything, but faith working through love, does not this same principle require us to say that, according to the mind of Jesus Christ, neither baptism nor unbaptism availeth anything, but faith working through love?

To sum up this general survey: First, there is no express command of Jesus that His followers should be baptized, and the only implied command is a parteciple in the Great Commission; and there is no recorded instance in the New Testament where this implied command was ever literally fulfilled. Second, the ordinance of baptism was universally practiced in the early Church, but it exists side by side with Jewish ordinances, and apostolic thought is not clear as to its authority and significance. Third, the compromise between legalism and faith at length became intolerable, and Paul was led to challenge the right of faith and to declare the total abolishment of all the required ordinances of Jewish legalism. And does not the same principle of faith which abolishes a required ordinance of circumcision apply equally to a required ordinance of baptism? Taking the New Testament as a whole, I do not think it is clear beyond a reasonable doubt that Jesus intended baptism to be a required ordinance. And it is as clear as sunlight that He has laid the greatest



emphasis upon faith, love, self-denial, and service. But apart from my own conclusion, I would summon the Baptist Church to a fresh examination of the ground whereon we stand when we say to men that they must be baptized before we can fully recognize them as followers of our Lord.

But I see an authority above all, an authority greater than recorded words. I see a guide more certain and convincing than any Greek text or specific command. It is the authority of the mind of Christ. I believe we shall look in vain for rules and prescribed ordinances in the New Testament; for Jesus Christ came into the world to give men newness of life, and he has lifted them out of bondage to ordinances into a free and personal communion with the Heavenly Father. I believe our highest guide and supreme authority is the mind of Christ as we learn it from all He has said and done, and from all that is said of Him. The Church has long since passed out from under the dominion of literal commands. We do not say that fasting is a required ordinance, though Jesus and the early Church fasted. We do not hold that foot-washing is a required ordinance, though Jesus Himself washed the disciples' feet, and said, expressly: "Ye ought to wash one another's feet." We do not regard the holy kiss as a required ordinance, though it is enjoined five times by the word of the Apostles. We do not hold these things to be required ordinances, because we feel that it would not be according to the mind of Christ so to do. Gradually we have come to see that specific examples and commands are to be understood according to the whole mind and Spirit of Christ. And ultimately we must take our attention from the letter that enslaves, and, looking at the whole revelation of God in Christ, we must ask whether it is according to the mind and Spirit of our Master that we require baptism of men before we will have fellowship with them as His disciples.

I leave to you an unanswered question, but I look with joy and confidence toward the future. We are being led into a fuller light and into closer fellowship with Jesus Christ. Under the tutelage and inspiration of His Spirit we shall learn more and more what is the mind of Christ, and what are the essential conditions of discipleship. And with an untroubled faith I submit the question of the ordinances, their authority and function, to this final arbitrament.

DR. CARTER HELM JONES closed the session with prayer.

NOTE.—For a further treatment of this topic, see discussion at end of next Session.

## THIRD DAY.

*Morning Session.*

Thursday, November 16, 1905.

10 A. M.

---

VICE-PRESIDENT REV. G. P. OSBORNE presided in the absence of the President.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT: The hour has arrived for the commencement of the morning session. And I will ask Dr. Henderson, of Chicago, to offer up a prayer.

DR. HENDERSON then offered prayer.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT: The general theme for discussion this morning is, "What is the duty of the church to the defective and dependent classes?" The first paper is by Prof. C. R. Henderson, of Chicago University, Illinois.

PROF. C. R. HENDERSON, Chicago, Ill., then read as follows:

WHAT IS THE DUTY OF THE CHURCH TO THE  
DEFECTIVE AND DEPENDENT CLASSES ?

I. "*To the Law and the Testimony.*" The Lord of the Church has distinctly given us in precept, parable and example, the law of our duty to those in distress. In the parables of the lost coin, the lost sheep, and the lost son; in the story of the Good Samaritan; in the acted parable of the last hours, when Jesus washed the feet of His disciples; in the standard of His judgment day, when Jesus identified Himself with the naked, the hungry, the sick, the prisoner; and especially at Calvary when He died for us all—everywhere, in every word and deed, did the Lord Christ declare and enforce the duty of the Church to love, help and uplift the weak, the oppressed, the sinful, the perishing.

The Old Testament, the scriptures to which Jesus made appeal, contains a code of duty to the poor. God Himself is judge of the fatherless and the widow.

The Apostolic letters echo the teaching of Jesus, and the first formal organization of the Church after the inspiration of Pentecost was in the form of a protective, charitable and mutual benefit association.

This brief reminder is all that is needed in this Congress to bring into consciousness the familiar doctrine of the Bible.

Not that Christianity selects the feeble, the defective, the defeated, as more worthy or valuable than the strong; but that the weak are more apt to be overlooked and forgotten. The strong can take care of themselves. Our duty is to all men, as we have power and opportunity.

II. *The Argument from History.* There has never been a break in the apostolic succession of church charity. We have inherited a task and the lessons of experience in respect to methods. This history is not yet adequately written and presented in our own language, but the essential features are clear.

1. In the primitive Church the charity was *congregational*. The Church was, in the main, a body of poor persons, with an illegal and proscribed religion. The early Church had no endowments, lands, funds, or buildings. The ancient heathen world had no charity hospitals, no exemplary agencies of public relief. Slaves were cared for as property or pets, but free laborers were not protected by a general system.

For centuries of persecution the Christian Church overcame evil with good. Gibbon's testimony is explicit : One of the great causes of the Christian conquest of the Roman empire was the charity of the Christian people.

2. In the mediæval period the charity of the Church was more *specialized, institutional and official*.

The ecclesiastical administration became dominant over the civil, and the clergy monopolized culture and the agencies of benevolence. The parish, the hospital, the order, and the episcopal authority were the centers of relief. During the Middle Ages most charitable relief was administered by the Church; although the mediæval Church was never able to develop and provide a complete and adequate system of poor relief or of education.

3. During the modern period, beginning with the awakening of

a "burgher" spirit, before the Reformation, the tendency has been to develop some form of a *national* system of relief.

(a). In Protestant Teutonic countries this movement took shape earlier than in Latin and Roman Catholic lands. England, Germany and the United States are good examples of the system of *poor relief by law*, funds being supplied by taxation.

The chief causes of the change from ecclesiastical to civic control seem to have been: (1) The necessity of controlling the vagabonds and professional "sturdy" beggars, who constituted a serious menace to life and property; (2) the necessity of providing a general and reliable source and system of relief, since private charity was unequal and unreliable; (3) the adoption of Christian charity as a duty of the entire community.

Whatever may have been the causes, the fact is that in the countries of Northern Europe the chief agency of relief has come to be the State or its local divisions, while church charity and that of individuals and associations has taken an auxiliary and supplementary position.

For reasons of public safety, the care of the insane has come to be a matter of State concern; and the care of the feeble-minded, epileptics and inebriates is passing to the governments for the same reason. The care of vagabonds and degenerates can not be made an affair of voluntary benevolence.

The education of those with mere physical defects, as the blind and deaf, or crippled, is a part of the public school system, and is not now counted as a "charity" in the special sense.

(b). The tendency to bring all private and church charity under control of the State has been increasing in Latin and Catholic countries, as Belgium and Italy; while France, in its recent legislation (medical relief, in 1893; old age and incurable relief, in 1905) has actually passed from the ecclesiastical to the civic system.

Many religious people view this tendency with regret, because it deprives the clergy of an important social function; while others think it is a proof that charity to the weak, instead of being regarded as the duty of a profession, or a single association, has now been accepted as the duty of the entire nation.

When charity is made a part of the law of the land the Christian ideal becomes the common possession of the whole people. The tendency to specialize functions has stripped the Church of many

tasks which once belonged to her, and left her more free for her supreme work.

III. *The Basis of Present Obligation of the Church in Respect to Charitable Relief.* What are the essential and decisive facts in our situation which determine our duty? Without pretending to completeness, we may here properly consider:

1. The fact that *the poor are still with us*. Extreme poverty, the result of hereditary weakness, of personal vice, of external calamity, of social injustice and neglect, is here. Broken-down men, little children, helpless widows, mutilated workmen, worn-out criminals, innocent victims of greed and lust, the insane, the idiotic, constitute a certain per cent. of our population—never a great ratio of all.

If there were no dependents in the community the Church would have no duty in this direction. As the fact stands, we can not remain Christian and close our eyes to these sad spectacles, our ears to these appeals, our hearts to these sore needs.

2. The second fact in the situation is that the *State* system of legal relief exists. We have no right, as Christians and citizens, to ignore and neglect this legal organization and its institutions, and act as if it did not exist.

3. Another fact which a church has no moral right to ignore is that *other* churches, associations and individuals are trying to help the poor in many ways. The effect of want of understanding and co-operation with others is wholly or partly to defeat the purpose of charity, to increase moral degradation, to squander resources which are needed for social ends.

Charles Booth ("Life and Labour in London," 3d series, Vol. VII, p. 412) says: "Amongst those who claim help, three classes may, perhaps, be recognized: Poor Law cases, clergy cases, and charity organization society cases. An attempt made to watch the after fate of those whose applications had been refused by the society in one poor quarter of London disclosed that they had been helped by the clergy, *but were no better off.*"

He quotes the opinion of one of the Poor Law medical officers as to the value of voluntary charity: "He complains that it is generally spasmodic and inadequate, and hardly ever lasts a sufficient time to be of real service. He instanced the case of widows left with young children. 'Churches, chapels and the like intervene and give a little help, and the widow struggles on for a time, receiving

something one week and nothing the next. She and her children become gradually weaker (both morally and physically) through want of proper and sufficient food; and ultimately, broken down in health, and destitute, she comes upon the parish. It would have been better had she come at first."

My contention is that this spasmodic, inadequate, hysterical dole relief is immoral and anti-Christian; that it degrades the human beings whom we are sent to lift upward; that we increase the social burden which the State at last has to carry when our inconsiderate methods have made it as heavy as possible.

The end will be that the church charity, if thus administered, will excite public attention. The rights and welfare of the whole people must be considered above the whims of a part. Church charity which refuses to co-operate will have to be brought under State control and subjected to legal supervision. A beginning has already been made in this direction, owing to certain scandals in private and church institutions, due generally to neglect of scientific method rather than to mere wickedness. This necessity of State control appeared first at the Reformation, in connection with the repression of vagabondage. It has appeared more recently in the tendency to deprive the Church of the care of the insane, or to bring this care under State control. Recently child-saving institutions of the Church have compelled investigation and supervision. In all this modern governments are not enemies of religion; they simply act within their duty, as the only authorized representatives and organs of the interest and will of the whole people.

The Church is not the whole people, but only a part; and if it refuses to recognize the rights and interests of other associations and organizations, and so perpetuates anarchy and pauperism, it will array against itself all the gathering energies of modern science, backed by the power of the State.

To avoid this hopeless conflict, the Church has only to adopt the methods of modern science as its own, and then it can bring to the common service of relief the most precious influences of religion.

In Italy and France we see the State triumphant in this conflict, and Belgium will follow. In Germany and England there is difficulty; but there the State has its own system of relief, and is gradually defining the place of private charity.

In Indiana the State organization of each denomination appoints

a committee to study the problems of philanthropy, to visit the institutions of relief, to report the conditions and needs, and to co-operate with the State Board of Charities in educating a wise public opinion to secure good laws and administration.

If a church must give relief, there is one principle which will prevent much harm: *Give adequately*. Carry the case through. Spend enough to make thorough success possible. I am inclined to add another rule: Where there is a man, give only to him; never to his wife or children, save as a temporary shift. Make the man feel that he must bear the full measure of his responsibility for the support of his family and the education of his children.

4. The fourth fact is that the specific and characteristic function of the Church is to minister primarily to the *religious* and *moral* needs of men, and especially to those who are most apt to be neglected.

It is possible for the State to organize a tolerably efficient agency of relief of *material* needs; but only the Church can, especially in America, minister to the *spiritual* hunger and thirst of the miserable.

Many thousands of these fellow beings are shut up in institutions of States, counties and cities, and are thus cut off from the ordinary opportunities of the Church ministry to their souls.

5. Another significant fact is that, even in giving material relief, there is, alongside of legal measures, room and need for many kinds of *supplementary* relief, which State officers can not supply. Here the Church has an opportunity and a duty.

IV. *Method*. It has not yet dawned on many generous Christian people that it requires *knowledge* to make charity effective, or that science has done anything for the efficiency of relief.

No science is yet finished and complete. Only the deed is done! Social science, like chemistry and biology, is a living, growing body of principles, to which contributions are constantly made.

But already a body of principles is known, and these principles must be observed by the administrators of charitable relief, or the very purpose of benevolence will be defeated.

This body of principles I can not be expected to develop here and now; but you will be prepared to accept this conclusion: The Church should not set charlatans and quacks at work in this most delicate labor of cure of sick men; and therefore the Church should accept it as part of its duty to require at least a certain number of its leaders and directors of relief to acquire both the *theoretical*

*knowledge* and the *practical training* for the task of administration of its charitable institutions and associations.

This can be effected only by a central organization in each community, which the churches help to support, and in which they are represented; the Federation of Churches, in some form, is a necessity of our situation. Earnest and kind persons can be trusted to act, even if they have small ability and knowledge, if they are directed by a few competent administrators.

V. *Illustrations of the Duty of the Church Taken from Specific Fields.* Since it is impossible to survey the entire realm of charity in this hour of discussion, we must concentrate attention on certain typical tasks which make their appeal to the local churches.

1. In many splendidly organized charities there is a need of *inspired personal workers*; and the churches ought to *call Christians into this form of the ministry*. Miss Mary E. Richmond has expressed this idea from the standpoint of an expert observer and successful administrator in her book on "Friendly Visiting."

2. The duty of the Church in respect to the spiritual needs of the *inmates of public institutions* should here be urged.

The *county (or town) poorhouse* is found in some form in most parts of the country. It is a dreary place, and the company is not often attractive and agreeable. Many old people have lost their quickness of apprehension; many are the wrecks of vice and crime; some have descended from comfort to misery.

But these "paupers" are human beings. They need the encouragement of worship, the cheer of music, the fellowship of youth and hope, the message of divine love.

To win their confidence and affection, to find an open way to their hearts, many little kindnesses can be shown. In every county where there is a poorhouse there should be a committee of young Christian people, inspired and selected by the association of pastors, if necessary, which will conduct services of song and worship for the poor people on Sundays. There are the hospitals, where flower missions, with tactful and hopeful Christian messages, may so easily be conducted if there is a will to do and serve in Christ's name.

There is the county jail, or house of correction, where prisoners are confined and in desperate need of the evangel in word and worship and deed. But this is not work for raw youth; it is for prudent, trained visitors, approved by the warden or other authority.

3. One important field for the co-operative effort of churches



is the care of discharged or paroled prisoners and their families. Even the suspicion of crime makes a man an outcast, while actual conviction stamps his forehead with a blasting curse. It is difficult for a man whose last employer was a prison warden to secure employment. His fellow workmen shun him, and positions of trust are closed against him.

This treatment sinks into his soul and makes him desperate. Prisoners' Aid Societies have a claim upon the Church in many ways; and the agents of the State who are trying to place paroled prisoners should find local committees of Christian men ready to assist them.

VI. For the collective title for all this church charity the German "Evangelical" Church has coined the expressive name, "The Inner Mission." We have foreign missionary societies in all our denominations, whose duty it is to raise money and send missionaries to the non-Christian world. We have home and city mission societies, whose task is the evangelization of our own country.

Here and there we have parochial, denominational, and inter-denominational associations to give relief to needy families in their homes, to find family homes for orphans and morally imperiled children, to give spiritual and material help to sailors, woodsmen, cabmen, young women strange to city ways, cripples, street boys, and many others. This is the one field of the "Inner Mission."

The home and foreign missionary work is, for most of us, done by praying, giving and sending substitutes; the Inner Mission calls most directly for *personal service*.

In this department of organization the Roman Catholics and the German Lutherans are in advance of all others, and we must first learn from them before we can proceed to surpass them.

The Inner Mission is an effort to so help the dependent members of society, by promoting their physical well-being, their material interest and their cultural enjoyments, that they and all observers will be persuaded that our professions are sincere; that we love, not merely in word, but also in deed. It is also a direct effort to open the door for the teaching and persuading of evangelists. Soon or late our Inner Mission must extend its work upward and outward; to find a field in the *public schools* for moral and religious influences; to invoke the aid of the police authorities in regulating and controlling vice which destroys the effects of our mission labors; to influence legislation on behalf of factory children, and workingmen's insurance, to prevent pauperism and debasement.

The failure of missions of all sorts among the most degraded classes in our cities seems to be conceded. Isolated persons are helped. Selected individuals are rescued. But the sodden, apathetic, brutal mass grows in numbers. All schemes have been tried. Charitable relief sinks the parasite still lower in the mire.

Is the case hopeless? By no means. But *methods* must be changed in respect to the *lowest* class. Only the State can "drain this folk swamp," by enforced segregation.

In the compulsory and celibate farm colony, where orderly habits and total abstinence are *enforced*, religion has some chance; but *not in the freedom of the slums*.

My visit to Mexplas, Belgium, and to Nitzwyl, Switzerland, revealed to me a work for this class which the free colonies of Germany and the Salvation Army can never accomplish.

All individual, local and voluntary effort at last comes to the place where the State, as a divinely ordained agency of the Kingdom of God, must be recognized. What the Church can not properly attempt, it can inspire the Government to do. So long as we neglect this powerful agency we are leaving undone what we ought to do, and men are perishing because of our neglect.

The duty of the Church to the dependent does not end with those labors which are part of its own activity; we are called to employ all the means within our reach, as Christian citizens, to save the lost and restore them to righteousness and to God.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT: This important subject will be continued by Pres. Lee Smith, Ph.D., of Macon, Ga., who I now understand is absent, and the Secretary has a statement to make.

THE SECRETARY: I have a letter from President Smith stating that, owing to the unfortunate circumstance that his installation as president, in Macon, Ga., has been fixed just at this time, and it would be impossible for him to be in two places at once, he is compelled to forego the pleasure of being with us.

THE PRESIDENT: The first appointed speaker on this subject is Prof. R. S. Colwell, D.D., of Granville, O.

PROF. RICHARD S. COLWELL, D.D., of Granville, O.:

*Mr. President:* I am not at all sure that I understand what was intended to be the scope of the subject assigned to me. But, in

the absence of any official definition, I venture to put my own construction upon the words employed, and will speak of none but the theological and ethical phases of the topic. This is not, as a matter of course, because I do not think there are other phases, or that such phases are unimportant; but because I am altogether too deficient in knowledge and experience in regard to them to speak intelligently.

These theological and ethical phases have attracted my attention for many years, and I venture to present for your consideration certain conclusions about them which seem to me to be fairly clear and very important.

In my use of these terms "Deficient and Dependent Classes," I apply them to persons of imperfect or scanty, untrained mental powers, and to those whose time and energies are monopolized by the endeavor to gain the means of subsistence.

In the first place, let us look at the situation as I understand it to be. It is this: There are comparatively few of these classes in our churches. Practically, they do not think that the churches, with their companies of well appearing, well dressed people, are for them. They do not think that they stand high enough in the social scale to associate with church people. They look upon the churches as places for people who live on a plane decidedly above their own. They know in general what the avowed object is for which the churches exist; but there is nothing very distinct about it. It does not affect them closely. They do not think of themselves as having any relation to the churches. They know nothing and care nothing about the abstract principles for which the church stands. The church makes no appreciable appeal to them. It stirs in them small sense of guilt, and scant feeling of obligation. The inevitable and necessary result of this is that the church has little influence upon them, does little for them. They are outside the scope of its influence. This in rough outline I believe to be the situation on the side of these classes themselves.

On the other hand, the church admits and asserts that it is its duty and privilege to endeavor to bring the gospel truth to bear upon these classes as upon all others. The difficulty is to learn how it can be done most effectively. Much has been attempted; something has been done; but, on the whole, it is generally admitted that the church is accomplishing very little in comparison with what it should do in bringing these classes under the sway of Gospel truth. We want

to know along what lines of activity it can better discharge its duty to these classes.

It seems to me that there are two lines along which the church has not done its duty in the past, and is not doing its duty at the present time. For the sake of convenience, I would call the one the theoretical, or theological line, and the other the practical, or ethical line. And first I want to speak of the theoretical or theological line. I maintain that it is the duty of the church greatly to simplify and clarify and reduce its theoretical or theological demands upon these classes of the people. I think that at the present time one reason for the failure of the church to benefit these classes is that the demands of the church do not come to them in a clear and simple way. I do not refer to the character of the sermons of the individual preacher so much as to the net effect produced upon men by what they understand, or feel, or imagine that the church asks of them. I can not help thinking in this connection of the words of our Lord when, in denouncing the Scribes and Pharisees, he said: "They bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's shoulders." And a little later: "Ye shut up the Kingdom of Heaven against men." Of course, I am far from thinking that this is done intentionally, or even as a result of carelessness. But I do claim that it is done, that this is the result. I do not think that it is putting it too strongly to say that the demands now made by the church on these classes makes them feel that as a matter of fact it is simply impossible for them to think the thoughts or to live the life which the church demands that they think and live. The question as to whether they want to live such a life, or will try to live such a life, is forestalled and shut out as a practical matter by the feeling that it is for them out of the question. They feel that all the circumstances of their life render it impossible. And this very feeling on their part seems to me to suggest very plainly a part, at least, of the duty of the church. It is its duty to present its demands in such a way, so clearly, so simply, that it will be impossible for them to think this, if they are honest. In order to do this, the demands of the gospel for them must be few in number (though, of course, far-reaching in their scope) and easy to understand. At the present time, I contend, they are neither. It does not fall in with my present purpose to go back and argue that those who voice the claims of the gospel do not themselves hold it in this simple and clear way. That would lead me into another and broader field. I, in this connection, simply

claim that it is the duty of the church to present the claims of the gospel in this simple, clear, limited way to the classes of which I am speaking.

I suppose that the shortest and best way to make my meaning clear is to illustrate by specifying.

For a little way I will follow the order of some of our books on theology, and begin with what the church teaches about God. Now, it seems to me that the ideas of Christian people about God are anything but clear and simple. It seems to me that they are confused, indefinite, inconsistent, impractical, and not unfrequently absurd. I do not intend by this to imply that I think that each one should have an elaborate and exhaustive idea of God such as is to be found in a treatise on theology. Not that, by any means! I mean that, in regard to those theoretical and theological matters which closely touch human life and are at the base of everyday action, their ideas of God are a jumble. As a matter of course, they believe that God is perfect; but at the same time, and without any apparent hesitancy, they ascribe to him acts which, in other relations, they would declare to be imperfect or even wrong. Of course, it is easy to account for this confusion and inconsistency by remembering that it has come from the long-continued habit of accepting traits as of necessity inhering in the character of God without attempting to harmonize or co-ordinate them. But this explanation, however correct, does not at all change the situation; and I allude to it, not for the sake of bringing any charge against those who hold these ideas, but solely for the sake of making clear the point I am urging. It is not to be expected that the message of the church to these deficient and dependent classes will be much clearer than the recognition or conception of it on the part of the average church member. But the average church member has much in his life and surroundings to supplement and compensate for and adjust this confusion, which can not be assumed to exist among these classes referred to. So that the bringing this confused message to them is certain to be inefficient. So far is this true that it does not seem to me to be exaggerated to say that to present to these classes the ordinary, confused conception of God is to fail to make any good and lasting impression upon them. On the other hand, it seems to me that it is entirely possible and highly beneficial to convey to them a much simpler idea of God, which will lay the foundation for the realization of a better life. Notwithstanding the mys-

tery which must always surround the conception of God, it seems to me that the great essentials of it are easy to comprehend, even for the deficient classes, if only we are content to stop there. It is not a difficult thing, I believe, to make even the deficient classes understand that God is good, even according to a definition that is acceptable to them; that he loves them; that his attitude toward them is loving and beneficent; that his demands upon them are not unreasonable and impossible of fulfilment on their part, but, on the contrary, are such as they themselves must admit are both reasonable and salutary.

Again, in the matter of what we call conversion, it is, in my judgment, the duty of the church to be very simple in what it teaches these classes. I venture the assertion that to present to the average specimen of these classes referred to the ordinary hazy conception of what conversion really is, is to produce a still more hazy impression, and to lead to no action at all on their part. Even among those who have been brought up under Christian influences it often, perhaps I may say usually, happens that one does not understand at all what he is to do, but feels that he is to wait for something to happen, the happening of which will not be known to him when it occurs. When that mysterious thing takes place he will be a Christian; till it does he is a sinner. Now, it is unreasonable to expect that the presentation of such an indefinite thing as that is to lead to very much newness of life on the part of the deficient or dependent. It will not. On the other hand, it is reasonable to expect that, if put in a proper way, the salient features of Paul's conversion, which we call a wonderful conversion, will be understood and may be duplicated. They are capable of hearing the voice, of asking intelligently, "What wilt thou have me do?" and of obeying the plain command.

I will content myself with calling attention to one other subject in this theoretical or theological line, where it seems to me imperative that the church speak in a much more clear and simple way. It is in its teaching about the relation of the sinner to Christ. It does not seem to me reasonable to expect that any appreciable number of these classes are to understand the common teachings of the church on this subject. It is too abstract, too symbolical. It demands either a type of mind like what exists in the Orient or a familiarity with the truth which it is intended to express, either of which is lacking in these cases. For example, to tell an indi-

vidual of these classes that he can not do anything good, or please his Maker, unless he is in union with Christ, is one with him, is to give strong meat to a babe. It is to tell him something that he can not understand and that will not do him any good. Even to quote to him our Lord's language about the vine and the branches will not help much. The men to whom our Lord spoke when he used that illustration were unfamiliar with that sort of speech and could understand him. These men can not. To talk to them in that way is to mystify them and add strength to the impression that the gospel is above them, out of their reach. On the other hand, the great but simple fact that Christ died for sinners because he loved them, and is to be obeyed and loved because he is their greatest friend and benefactor, can be understood and appropriated by any one who has sufficient intelligence to become morally responsible.

The line of thought which I have been trying to present in regard to what, for convenience, I have called the theoretical and theological phases, as a matter of course, indicates the line I wish to follow in speaking of the ethical and practical phases of my subject. I make the same statement in regard to these phases. I contend that it is the duty of the church to greatly simplify and reduce its demands upon these classes in ethical and practical matters; to demand less of them than it demands of higher classes. And, since I am of necessity speaking in general outline, it is neither appropriate nor necessary that I enter into details farther than is necessary to indicate my meaning. But I want it to be clear that I do not refer to such ethical demands as the demand for honesty, purity, truthfulness, etc., because these are too well understood and admitted to call for any discussion whatever. I refer to such demands and teachings as those which apply to time for prayer and private devotions, to the time for public religious services, to amusements, and even to the observance of the Lord's Day, Sunday. In regard to all these and similar matters I do not hesitate to claim that it is the duty of the church to make its demands very few and very simple when dealing with the deficient and dependent classes. They should be so few and so simple as to be well within the reach of those to whom they are addressed. In my opinion, this is exceedingly important. To make any individual think that the obedience and service demanded of him by the gospel is impossible for him to render is certain, sooner or later, to destroy the power of that gospel over him. He soon comes to disregard entirely an obligation

which he is convinced he can never meet, or even to regard its author as unjust. It seems to me exceedingly unfortunate that up to this time the church has frequently made just this mistake of demanding of all what some could not perform; and so it has intensified the impression among these classes that religion is not for them. It is helpful to remember that one count in the great indictment which our Lord brought against the religious teachers among the Jews was this, that they taught the people that the only religious life acceptable to God was a life which it was absolutely impossible for the common man to live. In these matters it seems to me that the church is in danger of disregarding the plan of perfect wisdom illustrated all through the Old Testament, and not discontinued in the New. It is that of toning down, if you please to call it so, the demands made to the condition of the people for whom they were given. It was a simple code that was given to the Children of Israel in the desert of Sinai, and even that in force among the disciples of our Lord himself was far less elaborate than what is now demanded as appropriate.

It is, then, in my judgment, the duty of the church, in dealing with the deficient and dependent classes, to follow, though it may be from afar, after the plan adopted by Jehovah God in dealing with his ignorant and sinful children.

But there are two or three objections among the many alleged against this way of thinking which are of sufficient currency to need mention, even in as brief a presentation of the subject as this.

The first of these objections is that this way of doing represents the gospel as different for different classes of people, and even for different individuals; whereas it ought to be represented as one and the same for all people everywhere. My answer to this objection is a full admission that this way of doing does, as asserted, make the gospel different for different classes of people, and for different individuals as well. But, instead of this being any objection, in reality my contention is that it is merely a restatement of the strongest consideration in its favor. The gospel is a different gospel for each class and for each individual. Any other gospel would be a monstrosity. Individuality is one of the great characteristics of the human race, and to ignore it would be an inconceivable folly. It is by virtue of the very fact that it adjusts itself to each individual that it becomes the power of God unto salvation to every soul that believeth. The second objection, closely related to and really in-



volved in the first, is that this diversity destroys the unity of the gospel. My answer to this objection is that such a view of the gospel unity ignores the fact that, while truth is one and eternal, the application of it to life must vary as the lives vary, as conditions vary, as the individuals vary. The unity of the truth is not disturbed by the fact that different aspects of it are seen by different individuals at different times. The very greatness and grandness of the truth makes this inevitable. It is only the small truths that can be grasped and comprehended fully and completely by slight mental effort which appear always the same to every individual who comprehends them. The great laws, whether in the material or the spiritual realm, are not of this sort. And so it appears that this objection really assumes that the great truths of the gospel can be fully compassed, comprehended, or surrounded by a single mind, and that all other comprehensions of them must be identical with that—a manifestly absurd assumption.

But another, much more common, though less serious, objection is that of those who claim that this treatment of the gospel weakens its grip upon the minds of men by abandoning its firm and unvarying demands upon all men everywhere. Their objection is put in language something like this: If by the use of our reason we are to vary the demands of the gospel, relaxing them in the case of some individuals, adjusting them in the case of others, and strengthening them in the case of still others, then the real authority of the gospel is dissipated, and has become dependent upon the caprice of the individual.

A part of this ground has been covered already in the discussion of the ultimate authority among Protestants, and there is neither time nor occasion to enter it here; but it suffices for my present purpose to reply that in point of fact this varying and relaxing, and adjusting and strengthening is an established state of affairs which always has existed, and always must exist wherever human life exists. To endeavor to escape such a state of affairs is futile. It can not be done. And therefore this which I am urging is merely a conforming in an explicit way, in definite particulars, to an existing situation. And, instead of weakening the grip of the gospel truth, it recognizes it as all the more secure, because more flexible and closely adjustable to every possible set of circumstances.

THE PRESIDENT: The next appointed speaker on this subject is the Rev. S. Z. Batten, of Lincoln, Neb.

REV. S. Z. BATTEN: *Mr. President and Brethren:* That such questions as this are being considered by Christian men is a hopeful sign of the times. That they are being considered in a truly Christian and sociological spirit is an even more auspicious sign of promise. In saying this, one does not mean to imply that it is the first time in the world's history that such questions have been considered. One could easily fill a volume with quotations from Christian writings of all ages showing that the duty of Christian people toward the needy and miserable classes has been generally recognized.

The Son of Man, in his life and teaching, has set up a standard for all men and for all ages. He emphasized with all the force of his life and with all the meaning of eternity the duty of administering to the suffering and helpless. In the parable of The Judgment we find that the destiny of men turns upon the way they have fulfilled or neglected these simple human ministries. "I was hungry and ye gave me meat, I was thirsty and ye gave me drink, I was a stranger and ye took me in, naked and ye clothed me. I was sick and in prison and ye came unto me. Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." In the light of Christ's life and teaching we may say that the man who feels no interest in the needy and helpless brother does not know Jesus Christ as he ought to know him; he is yet in the gall of bitterness and the bond of iniquity. And in the light of his life and teaching we may say that, for the present the only way to do good to God is to do good to some of his needy and backward children.

In the Christian centuries the disciples of Christ have felt an urgent call to minister to the needs of men. Before long the Christian spirit begins to move men to engage in various forms of philanthropic service. This is seen, for one thing, in the Apostolic Church, and we know how, within a generation, provision is made for the care of the widows and orphans. Before long the Christian spirit incarnates itself in various philanthropic agencies, and soon we see hospitals and asylums arising throughout the Christian world. There were charitable people before Christ came; there were various forms

of philanthropic relief known in Greece and Rome; there were hospitals and burial associations in many parts of the ancient world. But such things at best were spasmodic and weak, and were not recognized as essential forms of right citizenship. But within the church we find that the leaders feel an obligation upon them of ministering to the needs of men. Soon the horrors of slavery were lessened, and masters deem it a meritorious thing to manumit their slaves. Soon a new sense of responsibility fills the hearts of parents, and children are no longer exposed to perish. In 364 Valentinian issues a proclamation in which he declares that the true worship of God consists in helping the poor and relieving those in distress. In Justinian's Code provision is made for hospitals for needy mothers. In Rome the first hospital is built about the close of the fourth century. In many parts of Europe the obligation is imposed upon the clergy of supporting and feeding the poor and dependent. The spirit of the times can best be illustrated by an incident in the life of Gregory the Great. When he was Bishop of Rome he was told that a man had been found dead in the streets, starved to death. Gregory excommunicated himself, shut himself up in a cell and sought to atone by hard austerities for his neglect toward the poor starveling. He declared that he was unfit to be Bishop in a city where such a thing could occur.

Throughout all the Middle Ages the churches felt an obligation upon them of caring for the needy and dependent classes. The monasteries were, in a sense, great relief centers; funds were gathered and relief was distributed to all who applied; whether wisely or unwisely, the men sought to fulfill their obligations toward their suffering and defective brothers. Our Protestant churches, it may be said, inherited this impulse, and they have not been one whit behind their Roman predecessors. As a consequence, in Protestant lands we have all kinds of charitable organizations and philanthropic institutions—the orphanage, the hospital, the asylum, the relief society, the soup kitchen, the sewing circle, the prison association, and the many other forms of Christian philanthropy. Perhaps the spirit of our Protestant philanthropy is best illustrated in the remark of Spurgeon, when criticised for some of his theological views: "Well, the God that answereth by orphanages let him be God."

But in these days a new Christian spirit is abroad and a new conception of Christian duty is seen. Our age is characterized by a new search for causes; to-day men are asking whether it is necessary

that there be any delinquent and dependent classes at all; and already some are daring to say that such words must soon be omitted from our vocabulary. Let us look at this subject from two sides.

Throughout all the ages of the past certain evils have been recognized as inevitable and necessary. Men have felt that in the present dispensation at least—this age of iron and blood—there must be about so much sorrow and need in the world. The time has been when Bishops of the Church seriously defended the thesis that it is necessary that there be poor and miserable people in the world in order that Christian men may gain merit and win a crown by ministering to these needy ones. The words of the Old Testament have been quoted in confirmation of this view: "The poor shall not cease out of the land forever." The words of Christ have also been adduced in defense of this conception: "The poor ye have always with you." It has been assumed that these words prove conclusively that dependents and defectives always have been, and, in fact, always must be. But such a conclusion we must contend is utterly alien to the Christian spirit; they who deduce this doctrine from the Scriptures are like those men of old who wrest the Scriptures not only to their own destruction but also to that of others. For one thing, the Revised Version, in Deut. 15: 4, declares, "There shall be no poor with thee." The whole intent of the Mosaic legislation, especially in its land laws and its jubilee provisions, was to prevent the creation of a permanent dependent class; the purpose of that legislation was to equalize conditions in each new generation, and thus to enable the weaker members of society to regain their foothold in the nation. Those who argue for the necessity of dependent and defective classes are strangely blind to the great prophetic hopes of Israel. The prophets one and all foresee a time when poverty shall be no more; when suffering shall be over; when in a new and righteous world men shall live in peace and happiness; when, in a word, every soul shall possess a full inheritance in the nation's life. And this is the teaching of Christ as well. "It is not the will of the Father who is in heaven that one of his little ones should perish." So long as these words stand, that long we must believe that God does not ordain these social underlings and social wastrels. So long as these words stand written, that long we have divine warrant for what may be called the new philanthropy. Too long the idea has prevailed that the worth of the race is comprehended in a few select individuals; too long men have supposed that the great mass of man-

kind are made to serve as so much fertilizer around the roots of a few elect plants; too long men have taught that it is necessary for a large percentage of the people to toil in misery and to die in want in order that conditions may be obtained for a few chosen members of the race. These ideas, which have been too long current in modern society, would have seemed ancient and barbarous to Moses, and Socrates would have been stoned on the streets of Athens as a corrupter of youth for teaching doctrines that have been promulgated from Christian pulpits.

To-day we are beginning to ask in all seriousness whether it is necessary that there shall be any so-called lower classes; to-day we are learning to ask whether it is necessary that great numbers shall be doomed from birth to hard and untoward conditions in order that a few may live in luxury and culture; to-day we are beginning to ask whether it is necessary that there may be any dependent and defective classes in a self-respecting and Christian society. One of the most unfortunate translations in the world is the substitution of Charity for Love in the New Testament. Charity scatters gold and bread, and in nine cases out of ten it increases the very thing it is seeking to relieve. Love sees in the needy one a brother, and seeks to remove the causes of his troubles and to set him on his feet in health and strength. The parable of the Good Samaritan has done more, perhaps, than any other discourse in the world to teach the duty of charity and philanthropy. So far as it goes, the parable is simply perfect, and the duty of caring for the needy and suffering is most clearly set forth. Thus far the churches have been satisfied to fulfill the first part of this parable, and so they have organized relief societies to care for the travelers along the Jericho road. But let us carry the parable just one step farther. The Good Samaritan has cared for the wounded traveler; he has taken him to the inn and has provided for his support till he can stand upon his feet again. Now, what is the duty of this Good Samaritan? Shall he organize a charity organization society to care for wounded travelers along that road? Shall he build a hospital to nurse the wounded back to life and health? No, not at all. Now let him go up to Jerusalem and call upon the Roman magistrate—the magistrate whom Paul calls the deacon of God unto men for good—and ask him to clean out that nest of robbers and to patrol that bit of dangerous road. To remove effects we are learning we must change causes. To potter with effects when we can change causes is simply

solemn trifling. We are beginning to ask in all sincerity whether it is necessary that there be any dependent and defective classes in society. We are beginning to believe that the presence of such classes in society is an impeachment of the good judgment and Christian spirit of our modern churches. We build great prisons and hospitals and boast of them; we show them to our visitors and call ourselves benevolent people. But the time is coming when we shall be ashamed of such great institutions; the time is coming when the very presence of these institutions will be a declaration that the people of that community are neither very wise nor very Christian in their spirit and methods. The duty of the Church toward the dependent and defective classes is, in brief, this: The Church must begin to teach that such classes are not inevitable and necessary; the churches must begin to create the social conscience which shall move men to arise and remove the causes which are creating dependents and defectives.

We may look at this question from another side, the Sociological. The history of progress, it has been said, is the record of the gradual diminution of waste. In all the lower stages of life the amount of waste is enormous, and comparatively few living creatures reach maturity. In the jungle, where life is a free fight, only those creatures who are possessed of full vitality and alert senses have any chance for survival; the weak, the crippled, the dull-eyed, the heavy-footed, are doomed from the start and invariably perish. As we rise in the scale we find that the amount of waste is diminishing and fewer creatures perish in the struggle of life. In a savage society, where the struggle is little modified by intelligent and moral action, the number who fail to survive is, however, still large; the weak and defectives, being uncared for, perish; the various diseases mean a high death rate; and added to all this we find the factor of occasional famine and almost chronic warfare. In the higher stages among civilized men this waste is reduced to the minimum and life has a higher value. In a civilized society, where the more humane and altruistic factors are in operation, the severity of the struggle is lessened; the person is protected on all sides and the average age of man is increased; the agents of famine and warfare are steadily eliminated, and human life has more chances of surviving in the struggle. The history of civilization, as Professor Huxley assures us, is the record of the attempts which the human race has made to escape the unchecked sway of this principle of struggle for ex-

istence with the destruction of the unfittest. But is this a benefit to the race or not? There are those who tell us plainly that this is no boon at all; in fact, they declare that it means the steady retrogression and weakening of the race.

In the course of the Christian centuries, as we have seen, the Christian spirit has created many forms of charitable service and eleemosynary institutions. In the progress of science there have been evolved various methods of medical practice which result in the lessening of disease and the lengthening of human life. In a natural and uncivilized society the mental and physical weaklings, the defectives, the mal-endowed, the diseased, the unfit, being left to the unhindered action of natural selection, are rigidly and ruthlessly exterminated. Thus the blood of the race is kept comparatively pure and the highest efficiency of the tribe is maintained. In such a society the weak in body or in mind are sometimes left to perish on the mountains or in the forest; more often they are left to shift for themselves, and the result is the same. In a savage tribe there are few mental and physical weaklings; the diseased and mal-endowed receive no care, and they unfailingly perish. The savage tribe has no pauper class, no dependent and defective elements. The struggle is severe and the results are tragic, but none the less the average efficiency of the tribe is well maintained.

But in a civilized and Christian society all this is changed. The weaklings and defectives, the mal-endowed and diseased, the outcast and the child of tainted blood are kept alive and cared for. All this is proper and right, and every lover of his kind must rejoice in this triumph of science and love over disease and death. But now comes the Scientist and the Sociologist, and they tell us in solemn words that this is a mistaken and destructive policy; this means the poisoning of the blood of the race; this will result in the retardation of human progress rather than in its acceleration. In course of time these persons who are kept alive by artificial means, having reached maturity, marry, and beget offspring after their own likeness. Thus it comes about that the less fit members of the race in a civilized and artificial society are enabled to survive in the struggle and to pass on their defects to their children, to poison the blood of the race and to hinder society in its onward march.

Thus Mr. Spencer finds fault with modern governmental and social organizations on the ground that they are interfering with the beneficent operation of the natural law of human struggle. Incon-

venience, suffering and death are the penalties attached by Nature to ignorance as well as incompetence—are also means of remedying these. Partly by weeding out those of lowest development and partly by subjecting those who remain to the never-ceasing discipline of experience Nature secures the growth of a race who shall both understand the conditions of existence and be able to act up to them. It is best to let the foolish man suffer the penalty of his foolishness. A sad population of imbeciles would our schemers fill the world with could their plans last. Why, the whole effect of Nature is to get rid of such—to clear the world of them and make room for better. ("Social Statics, Sanitary Supervision.") Professor Sumner is of the same opinion and speaks to the same effect. "Nature has no system for handicapping superiorities." On the contrary, she gives them full operation. And my friend, Professor E. A. Ross, is of the same mind: "The shortest way to make this world a heaven is to let those so inclined hurry hellwards at their own pace." Hence he deduces a social canon: "Social interference should not be so paternal as to check the self-extinction of the morally ill-constituted." ("Social Control," p. 425.) He maintains that many of our modern so-called charitable and philanthropic efforts and methods are simply preserving the unfit, and are thus poisoning the blood of the race. One has heard able churchmen maintain the thesis that the liquor traffic, for example, must not be abolished, as alcohol is one of the most effective agents in detecting the mentally defective and morally unfit and in exterminating them.

It is easy, of course, for one to denounce all this as brutal indifference and scientific hard-heartedness. But none the less there is here a grave danger, one that must be recognized and avoided, or the race will pay the forfeit. The universe sets a premium upon efficiency and fitness, and any method that enables the unfit and defective to survive and perpetuate is a gross and flagrant violation of the order of things. Modern society being more or less motivated by the spirit of Christ, will never again allow the unfit and defective to live uncared for and to die unpitied. In fact, as time goes on the Christian spirit will call to its aid scientific knowledge to keep the weakest and unfittest from perishing in the struggle. And, on the other hand, modern society, having an intelligent concern for its own interests, will not be willing to allow the unfit and defective to survive and perpetuate their kind to the disadvantage and detriment of the race. Is there any way out of this dilemma? Or must the Christian spirit and the scientific mind work at cross-purposes?



Let us now put together the two truths that we have considered and see what the result is. We shall then be in a better position to understand the duty of the Church with reference to the dependent and defective classes. And we shall be able also to discover the items in the Church's program in behalf of the world that is to be.

For one thing, the churches must encourage all those investigators who are seeking to know the causes of crime, poverty and disease. In a word, the Christian philanthropist must be a Sociologist, and the Sociologist must give the Christian a point of view and a method of work. We must know what are the causes of poverty, crime and disease; for we have gone far enough already to know that these things have causes; they are not to be charged up against the necessary order of nature; nor must we commit the blasphemy of saying that God ordains these and sends them into life doomed from the start. To say that God ordains these things is to impeach at once his goodness and his love; to say that he is satisfied with the world as it is—is to convict ourselves of unbelief and blindness. We must know the causes of these distressful phenomena of society—the criminal, the tramp, the orphan, the mal-endowed, the defective; we must seek to remove the causes of these things; we must seek to secure conditions which will insure a larger proportion of sane, well-endowed, healthy, morally disposed, fit people in the community. There are those who take a short cut out of this difficulty and say that all these are due to the innate depravity of the individual defective. This may be satisfactory enough as far as it goes, but it is simply no answer at all. The man who says that all the sickness and crime and pauperism in the world are due to the natural depravity of the individual advertises his own ignorance and betrays his own folly. Society, says Victor Hugo, has just the kind of criminals that it deserves.

My time does not allow me to develop this point in detail, but an illustration or two may serve our purpose. For one thing, it is agreed on all hands that intemperance is responsible for a large part of the crime, pauperism and insanity in the land. But while the churches admit the evil of intemperance, they stand in the presence of this evil confused and helpless. The churches have no program of action with reference to this social curse, and this is a sign of sinful inefficiency on the part of the churches. Again, slum districts are no less potent causes of social demoralization and criminal

products. But thus far we have taken slums as a matter of course, and have no program with reference to their draining and improvement.

For another thing, the churches must put their resources in pledge in behalf of the weakest and least promising member of society, that he may be lifted up into strength and fitness. Modern science and Christian philanthropy must direct their energies toward the creations of conditions that will prevent the making of the unfit and the defective. The unfit must not be allowed to remain the unfit, but they must be transformed into the fit. But, more important than this, society must take whatever precautions are necessary against the making of unfit and defective members in any part of society. The science of medicine and the practice of charity have put into our hands certain systems of moral splints and braces, certain remedies and appliances which enable us to keep the dependents and defectives alive. But all this may be no boon to the race; nay, it may rather result in loss to the race. There is now one duty that is all-important, and nothing must be allowed to becloud our minds. We must safeguard the race against degeneration by guaranteeing that there shall be no dependent and defective classes in society. This is a great undertaking, and it will require long generations for men to reach the goal. But it is the task to which the churches must summon men; it is the task that society must undertake in a brave and hopeful spirit. Everything may not be done at once, but something may be done that will bring us a little nearer the goal. In the prosecution of this task it will be necessary for society to have some definite, scientific and Christian program of action. One former is worth a hundred reformers. Preformation is better than reformation. Prevention is cheaper, easier, more Christian than reconstruction. The churches must make men know that the best way to cure results is to remove causes.

And, for another thing, the churches must put their profession and their resources in pledge in behalf of a higher and more Christian type of human society. The Christian spirit has created the finest type of personal piety; it has created the Christian home, one of the most splendid achievements in the world; it has created also the Christian Church, which is here as the continuous incarnation of the Christ. But the Christian spirit is now confronted with the task of creating a finer, higher and more Christian type of human society; for, as Professor F. C. French says in a personal letter,

"Society needs saving as much as the individual. In the long run the success of Christianity in regenerating men will be measured by its success in regenerating society." The Church has dealt thus far with the problem of saving sinners; it must now deal with the problem of saving men from sin. The Church has sought thus far to save men from a hell hereafter; it must now abolish the hells of this world and put out their fires forever. The churches must put their faith and their resources in pledge in behalf of the program: there shall be no dependent and defective classes in the land. This is a great undertaking, I know, but it is an undertaking to which we are squarely and fairly committed in the Gospel of the Kingdom of God on earth.

There must be a more intelligent and sympathetic co-operation on the part of the three great institutions of man's life—the Church, the family and the State. The Church has a great work before it in creating the social conscience which shall move men to put their profession and their lives in pledge in behalf of a better and more Christian type of society. The Church must hold up before men the great ideal of the Kingdom of God, and must inspire men to arise and seek that kingdom. The *family* must be made to understand its divine calling in the world, and must be made to know that it is the most important agency in the making of the world that is to be. The well-endowed and qualified, the intelligent and the healthy, must fulfill their obligations toward the race and must be willing to bear the burden of a family circle. The men and women who, through self-interest and self-love, refuse to bear children and thus serve the race, in the light of the ideal of the Kingdom of God must be pronounced the most irreligious and sinful members in the community. And the *State* must be shown its real mission in the world and must set itself the task of fulfilling its mission. In the words of President Roosevelt, "Questions like the tariff and the currency are of literally no consequence whatsoever compared with the vital question of having the unit of our social life—the home—preserved." Some time, in some far-off age, as Ruskin intimates, the manufacture of souls of a good quality may at last turn out to be a leading lucrative business. More and more, as men become more intelligent and Christian, merely financial questions will fall into the background and questions of human welfare and social interest will come into the foreground. The scientist, the theologian and the philanthropist will more and more co-operate in the making

of the world and in the transformation of society. Then will the race advance by leaps and bounds, for there will be no unfit and defectives to poison the blood and to hamper the march.

THE PRESIDENT: *Brethren*: There has been sent up to the desk the card of President E. W. Hunt, LL.D., of Granville, O., and we will hear from him.

PRESIDENT E. W. HUNT: *Mr. President, Brothers and Sisters*: I do not see how anybody could listen on any of these topics for a few moments and not fill up with something or other that he feels he must get rid of. I do not know which of the three topics I have heard discussed in this Congress I wish most to speak about. I am interested in every one of them; they are all related, as it seems to me.

I was interested, as every one of us was, in the discussion of last evening. I wish I had time to talk about both subjects, last night's and this morning's.

It is a little difficult for us Baptists to steer consistently a middle course, which belongs to us, between the Quaker position and the Sacramentarian position; but it seems to me we ought to be able to recognize two different sorts of authority, the legal or verbal and the essential or vital. We are not to discuss the function of ordinances in connection with religion in general; perhaps there is more necessity of considering the function of ordinances in connection with the Christian religion. Jesus very seldom tells us you must do this, you must not do that. He set himself to implant the life, and somehow that life comes to express itself in certain natural ways; and it is because the Christian ordinances are vitally related to that life that they seem to us to have the authority that they have. Is there any single specific passage, which is certainly satisfying, not only to us, but to any one who comes asking "Must I do this thing?" When that minimum Christian comes to us, who wants to do enough to get inside the gates, and be regarded as decent upon this side, but does not want to do one single thing that he is not forced to do for that purpose, is there some line or passage to which we can refer him which will settle the matter? It is sufficiently clear in the New Testament that those who had become united with Christ did certain things invariably; that they were baptized; that they continued to remember the Lord in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper. There

are vital relationships of these ordinances to the life which they had begun to live. Jesus never suggested anything which was not natural. The relation, as I have said, of the ordinances to religion in general is a real one, like that of leaves to the tree. If you will patiently pluck all the leaves from a tree in the spring you can kill it just as effectively as if you cut at the root. The Christian life needs expression and suffers for lack of it. When it is real it longs for expression in some way. When you don't find that desire for expression, there is still something lacking there. I believe something more needs to be done for that life when one comes up to the ordinance of baptism and balks. He needs more light. I believe, in the line of Dr. Hanley's suggestion last night, that one of the most important functions of the ordinances in a Baptist church is to keep a lot of people out of it; instead of taking down the bars and following out the particular method and regulations of the New Testament I would rather put them higher, for there are some people already in the Church that we would like to get rid of if we knew enough to do it safely. Instead of making it easier to get into the Church, I would make it more difficult if I possibly could. Church membership should mean more, not less.

A young married man whose wife was a Baptist came to my church. He had been baptized or sprinkled in the Congregational Church when about fourteen or fifteen years old. He came to me and said: "Brother Hunt, I would like to become a member of your church. I was baptized in the Congregational Church, and I meant that for a confession of Jesus Christ before the world. Now," he said, "as a matter of exegesis I believe that you are right with reference to the New Testament, and if I were to be baptized over I would want to be immersed; but if I were to be immersed it would simply be a mere form, and it seems to me intolerable to do anything under the guise of religion without purpose and meaning." I said to him: "You are teaching other men, trying to bring them to Christ. When they have surrendered to Christ, what are you going to tell them to do next?" "I shall tell them they ought to be baptized." "And what will you tell them that means?" "There's only one reply to that question." "But are you in a good position to make that reply?"

He soon came and asked to be baptized, to put himself in harmony with his convictions of New Testament teaching. As he expressed it, it was to be an act of cold-blooded obedience.

His baptism, however, was accompanied by a rush of emotion which surprised no one so much as himself, and seemed like the Lord's seal of approval.

THE PRESIDENT: I have the pleasure of receiving a card of the Rev. E. B. Pollard, Ph.D., of Georgetown, Ky., who will speak on the subject, "What Is the Function of Ordinances in Religion?" discussed last evening.

PROFESSOR E. B. POLLARD: *Mr. President:* Just a word or two with reference to the question raised by the last speaker yesterday. The question was, you remember, "Have the ordinances, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, the authority of Jesus?" Now, this is an important matter for Baptists. If the ordinances have not the authority of Jesus, then we may do as we please; but if they have his authority, then every loyal Christian should stand by them. The answer to this question is first found in an examination of the New Testament, looking into the documentary evidence. None of Christ's words on baptism has ever been questioned on documentary grounds. True, some have objected to the formula concerning baptism in the "Great Commission." That is, did Jesus Christ say that his disciples should be baptized *in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost?* The only evidence offered that the formula is an anachronism, from a later period, is that in other passages men were baptized "in the name of the Lord Jesus." But I beg of you to note that even here the question is really one of formula, and not of the fact that Christ did command baptism. He himself was baptized. We have John the Evangelist saying Jesus baptized through his disciples, who were acting in his name. At the close of his ministry came the Great Commission, which was within a few days followed by the command of the apostles that converts be baptized. And ever since we have had an unbroken performance of the ordinance.

It is true, the Christian religion is one of freedom, but freedom under the law of Christ. Is it inherently unlikely that Jesus, the most spiritual teacher the world has ever known, should have commanded the exercises of forms? Is it unlikely that he should have prescribed ordinances? As a great teacher, he must have known that religion has always expressed itself in outward forms and ceremonies. Would it not have been the part of a wise teacher to appoint two very simple ordinances, two very simple forms, and tell his disciples to do these for all time, until he come, rather than to

leave the matter entirely open, that the religious life might express itself in forms, at haphazard. Is it not inherently probable that, as a great religious teacher, he would have regulated the ceremonies of his religion. He commanded forms which would be simple and expressive enough to reach every heart, instead of leaving it to chance, or a false emphasis. He selected ordinances that set forth the vital doctrines of his life and of his gospel, his death and his resurrection, without which there could be no meaning to his religion, which is the doctrine *Through death to life*.

It seems to me to be altogether probable that the Great Teacher would have done just what he did.

Take baptism, for example; you can see the reasons for this. The ordinance expresses Christ's death and resurrection, and the need of man's dying with him and being raised to walk in newness of life—the central principle of Christianity.

The ordinances bring us continually to these central truths of the Christian life; and that is the reason we Baptists not only stand for the ordinance, but for the ordinance as first delivered to the Christian churches. If the ordinance is to be looked upon as a means of conveying spiritual grace, something of mysterious import, then I suppose almost any form would do. From this point of view, what is the difference between much water and little water? as is often asked. To this the Baptist answers, Baptism requires just sufficient water to set forth the teaching that Jesus meant to convey in the ordinance.

We are not after the form for its own sake, but the great doctrine that lies at the heart of Christianity—Christ's death and his resurrection; the Christian's death with Christ and being raised to new life. The value of the ordinances lie, then, in the vital nature of the truths symbolized—truths that are preached to the Christian and to the world, whenever the two ordinances are performed.

THE PRESIDENT: Are there any others who would like to speak on this subject? I see the Rev. G. W. Lasher, D.D., of this city, has something on his mind, and we will hear from him.

REV. G. W. LASHER, D.D.: *Mr. President:* There is some doubt whether I ought to speak at all; if I do speak, it is to this last question, "What is the Duty of the Church to the Defective and Dependent Classes?" My trouble is with the term Church; what is the

duty of the Church to the defective and dependent classes? I want to speak to that subject. Not what is the duty of Christianity; not what is the duty of the citizen, but what is the duty of the Church? The Church—now these people do not tell us what is meant by the Church; they seem to have characterized something that is not definite; they assume something. What do they mean by an organized or an unorganized Church? They have not given us something that has a definite form. Or do they mean simply the great body of the Church? I can understand what is the duty of this great organization or this great body as such. I can understand what is the duty of the individual Christian, what is the duty of the man who loves the Lord Jesus Christ; I can understand what is the duty of such to the defective and dependent class, but I cannot understand what is the duty of the Church by this universal phrase. When you come down to the local church, I am in great doubt as to that, because I cannot understand how a church of five members—and we have such—ten members or twenty members, how they are going to organize and do the work for the dependent and defective class. I cannot understand how a church of five members is going to do any large work in an organized form for the defective and dependent class. My trouble is there; what was the duty of the Church? I feel that we are in the air; that is the only thing I have to say.

THE PRESIDENT: Let us rise and sing the 466th hymn, after which the Rev. Theodore D. Soares will pronounce the benediction.

The benediction was pronounced and the session ended.



## THIRD DAY.

*Afternoon Session.*

Thursday, November 16.

3 P. M.

---

The sixth session of the Congress was called to order by the President at 3 o'clock.

THE PRESIDENT: Let us begin our services to-day by singing the 350th hymn.

THE PRESIDENT: Our topic for this afternoon is "The Christian Life a Normal Life." The first speaker is Rev. A. K. DeBlois, LL.D., of Chicago. (Applause.)

REV. A. K. DEBLOIS, Ph.D., LL.D., then addressed the Congress as follows:

## THE CHRISTIAN LIFE THE NORMAL LIFE.

The theme is stated categorically, not hypothetically. I accept it in the form in which it is stated. The Christian life is the normal life.

The normal life may be defined as the life which is controlled at every point by an established law or principle which in all its activities conforms to a definite and particular type or standard. It exhibits the phenomena of order, regularity and symmetry. The Christian life is a life which is lived in obedience to the teaching of Jesus Christ and under the guidance of his Holy Spirit.

That the Christian life is the normal life may be seen, first, by considering *the place and destiny of man in the moral order of the universe*. Our world is under law. This is the supreme truth which a century of science has brought forth. But more than this: God is in our world; it is his world; its law is his law. This is the joyous

cry of the Christian faith, an answering accent, affirming while it dignifies the most impressive utterance of science. We set beside the truth of the reign of law, fully and forever established, the truth of the presence of God in the midst of his creation; and we find the two truths to be one.

Now, in nature every normal process is a law-governed process. Further than this, it is a process which follows the rule of those laws which secure its perfect development. In so far as it obeys other laws, it becomes abnormal. The bird, the flower, the waving grain, the tree upon the hillside are normal when they follow the laws ordained for their development. In every case, by obedience to the laws of its being, the organism approaches the perfect type of its kind. In the world of nature, everywhere, each form and variety of life is seeking its type. There is an inner struggle, aided or hindered by the forces and conditions which surround it, to realize its ideal, its model. In so far as its evolution conforms to the natural laws which govern the production of its perfect type, it is normal. This is true in the realm of human life, as in all beneath it. The normal man yields a complete obedience to the laws set for his symmetrical and perfect development. By such obedience he conforms to his type.

We have seen, however, that the laws of nature are the expression of God's will. There is a perfect type for each living being. God gives the type. He fixes the standard. He has a plan for each human life. The normal life, then, is simply the life which is wrought out, is lived, in unwavering obedience to the laws of God which govern the attainment of the type. In such obedience it finds its rootings, its upward growth, its blossom, its fruitage.

In an ideal world the development would be harmonious and natural. God would express himself perfectly in and through each life. The question of abnormality would never enter. But we live in a world of imperfection. Considered in relation to human life, it is an evil world. Sometimes all vision of the type seems lost. Man is hampered and turned aside from the true standard, to which at every point he should conform, by the sin that doth so easily beset him. There are elements at war within him. He is not living the normal life—far from it! The man is out of proportion. In the normal tree the sap flows freely into trunk and branch and leaf and blossom. So in the normal man the life is evenly distributed. In the man as we know him, however, the vigor has been drawn off to cer-

tain parts, while other parts have become dry and useless. This vigor is exhausted in the sphere of the passions or the desires, in the service of the intellect or the will. Here or there the nature has been starved. There has been a radical departure from God's plan. We are all astray.

How can the normal life be restored? We need first the revelation of the type, and then the impulse which shall rearrange our life and fix it in normal channels. How can such revelation and such impulse be won? Not by might, nor by power, but by God's Spirit. He alone sees the type; he alone can furnish the clue—not by external or arbitrary processes, but by a new start, a regeneration. These words convey no meaning to us, as they did not to Nicodemus, unless we consider the character of Jesus Christ and the promise of his Spirit. Here we find both example and inspiration. In him we discover a life which is absolutely normal, wrought out in obedience to God's laws, in conformity with the perfect standard. From him we have the gift of the Divine Spirit, the Spirit of Wisdom, by whose aid we may order our lives according to God's holy law, and thus realize the standard.

Approaching the question from another point of view, the fact that the Christian life is the normal life may be understood by analyzing *the demand of the religious nature of man and his filial dependence upon God*. Has the man a definite religious nature? According to the doctrine of "total depravity," no! According to the teaching of a careful psychology, yes! Which is right? Let us see. If you have studied attentively the mind of your growing child, you have found abundant evidence of the existence of (1) a sense of God; (2) an inquiry after God; (3) a more or less decided ambition for some sort of fellowship with God. Crude and vague these feelings may all be, but so, also, are the moral and intellectual qualities of the child. Yet we do not dare to deny to him the possession of a definite moral and intellectual nature. Why, then, should we deny to him the possession of a definite religious nature? The three facts just indicated reveal the existence of such a nature and affirm its unmistakable, though half-unconscious, demand for union with God.

This religious nature is the ruling factor in the development of the normal life. There is a hierarchy of powers in every human soul. We rise from the animal nature to the intellectual and thence to the moral. Each must be subordinate to that above it. Now, if there be in man a religious nature, it must dominate and permeate

all parts of his life. Any other program would destroy the symmetry of the whole.

The possession of a religious nature is the possession of a divine nature. There is that in the essential quality of every human soul which is Godlike. This explains conscience. This explains repentance. This explains the deep longings and heroic struggles for the moral man to attain his ideal. This explains Gautama and Socrates and Marcus Aurelius. It is a Greek poet whom Paul quotes as saying: "We are his offspring; he is not far from any one of us." Attentive souls, even though shrouded in a pagan darkness, longing to win the normal, balanced life, have listened for the voice of him "in whom we live and move and have our being." They have believed with us that "God is just within the shadow, keeping watch above his own." Aye, more, that he is "nearer to us than breathing, closer than hands and feet."

Christ comes to banish the darkness and reveal the day. He comes to tell us that by virtue of the religious nature, common to us all, we are linked with God, we are children of God. The prodigal amongst the swine is not in his proper place. Every moment that he remains there he is outraging the deepest law of his being. His life cannot develop normally under such conditions. He belongs to his father. His father's home is calling him. His father's heart is calling him. His father's love, inwrought with the very texture of his soul, a part and parcel of his inmost self, is calling him. So he returns. And in the midst of his many tears and his contrite confessions he discerns his father's voice, in tenderest tones, exclaiming, "My son was dead and is alive again; he was lost and is found." Then he begins to live the normal life, under his father's eye, in full obedience to his father's will, in trustful communion with his father's love.

The key which unlocks the treasures of the gospel is the phrase, "Our Father!" The human race is a family, of which God is the head. He has a life-plan for each child of his. The Father is Christ's description of God. The willing and obedient child is Christ's simile of the Christian. "Become as children." How? Faith, hope and love are abundant in every child, unless the child is a degenerate, an abnormal, unhealthy, twisted creature. We sometimes say, "What a pity that the child must come to know evil and sin!" Alas, no other course is possible. But it is possible for the child as he passes into adolescence, and for the youth as he

passes into manhood, to cultivate persistently the Christian virtues, and so to make his life a constant progress and a constant triumph. It is possible to preserve that which makes childhood rare and beautiful. It is possible to retain the spirit of faith while outgrowing the ignorance of childhood, to retain the spirit of hope while outgrowing the fickleness of childhood, to retain the spirit of love while outgrowing the wayward passions of childhood. It is possible to grow up as a child in the family of the Good Father, earning ever-fresh revelations, gaining ever-larger spiritual outlooks, fulfilling the Father's plan and approaching the Father's standard for us. Such a growth would be entirely normal. Such a growth the Christian life inculcates.

That the Christian life is the normal life appears further in *the twofold character of that life in relation to the individual*. The Christian life is *a life according to man*. It makes its subject more truly human. It reveals the highest reaches of the human will, the rarest aromas of the human heart, the finest flower of the human soul.

The personality is the same, yet the expressions of that personality have changed. The man is more thoroughly a man. He is less tempestuous, but more virile. He is less obstinate, but more resolute. He has less self-confidence, but a more ardent faith. He lives less in the lower circles of life which ally him with the irrational creation, more in the higher circles which attest his kinship with an ideal humanity and with God. The fruits of the Spirit, regarded on their human side as productive of an erect and noble manhood, are "love, joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, self-control." The man is now realizing his best self. His life is essentially healthy. He is not less human, but more human. He is a righteous man, and his righteousness is rightness. He is clearing away the rubbish and wrongness which sin has wrought. His lower nature, which had mutinied and held the helm, is man before the mast again. His higher self is at the helm. He is a larger man. He is winning symmetry of character. He is approaching wholeness of life.

The Christian life is also *a life according to God*. It makes its subject more divine. The human and the divine are not contradictions, but correlates. The Christian life is a normal human life. All the powers, both rational and moral, are at their best and operating in their fullest efficiency. The Christian life is also a divine life. It

is more thoroughly human just because it is also superhuman. It is thrown open to the influence of the Infinite Spirit. God works in us. He works here, as in nature and in history, in conformity to law. Here again let it be said that he does not force upon the man a different and in some magical way a superior personality. He does not endow him with a new set of qualities or equip him with a new outfit of faculties. He uses in the man what he has already given to the man and the man himself has not used properly. But have not "old things passed away"? Assuredly! The man is now in line with God's purposes. God's Spirit sweeps through him, masters him. His hand is in the Father's hand, and the touch thrills him.

That the Christian life is the normal life may be further attested by examining *the laws and processes of the Christian life*.

We may study first *the new birth*. Is not this a unique and abnormal experience? It is unique in the history of every Christian. It is not abnormal. It is a passage from darkness to light. It is an emancipation. We leave the cell, the chain and the stripes. The law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made us free from the law of sin and death. We are delivered from the arbitrary and uncertain bondage of sin into the glorious liberty of the sons of God. This liberty is neither anarchic nor anomalous. It is not possible apart from law, but only through law. This submission to God's law is, in the case of the great sinner—the prodigal—a return. There has been so radical a departure from the normal that the recovery and recommencement are noteworthy. The phenomena of the "storm and stress" period, the critical years of adolescence, furnish, also, very often a more or less spectacular change at the time of conversion. But how often we hear a candidate for church membership say, "I grew up in a Christian home, among Christian influences. I do not know when I became a Christian." In such a case there has been no startling upheaval, no abnormal feature. If a definite line was crossed it was crossed unconsciously. The child has grown up into Christ. There has been a normal and orderly unfolding of the life, like the opening of the delicate petals of the flower at the sun's caress, in accordance with God's plan.

*The conditions of Christian discipleship* evince also the presence of normal relations. These are positive, constructive, natural. If it be said that Christian living from the outset necessitates a crushing negation, it may be answered that this is only apparently the

case. The negative principle of self-denial has been emphasized too much, the positive principle of love too little. The newly awakened spirit of love carries with it an inevitable destruction of fleshly and selfish limitations. Self-denial is really an aggressive battle of the love-spirit against the self-spirit. It is a positive condition, stated negatively. All products of the self-spirit are disintegrative. They injure the free play of the native powers. They curb the ardent, outrushing, effective, uplifting force of the man's personality. God seeks through the spiritual process the restoration of the personality to its normal working efficiency. Self-denial is thus the thrusting forth from the life of all narrowing, warping, darkening, deadening influences. The very names of these suggest the fact of their unwholesomeness. Greed, sloth, stinginess, pride, jealousy and the ranker sins are pathological. They are diseases weakening the soul and causing its decay. When a man begins the task of self-denial he has for his aid a constructive and powerful agency which makes for the perfection of the soul. This is indicated by the Master when he sets in the light of his life and its revelation the old commandments, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart; thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." To obey these conditions is to interlink our life with the entire life of God. In this view Christian discipleship becomes a perfect response to God's love for us, and a complete identification of ourselves with God's redemptive purpose for the world.

*The development of the Christian life*, like its origin and the conditions of its growth, is well ordered and normal. Not by spells or trances, or visions or cataclysms, but by the steady working of the laws of God in the human soul, is character refined, is holiness won. Not he who shouts God's name in some abnormal ecstasy, but he who goes straightforward in God's appointed way, is a Christian. "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven."

In religion, as in every other realm, God works according to law. Only those who are "workers together with God," who work sanely, consistently, persistently, can attain the Christian ideal. The pivotal fact in the culture of the Christian character is the recognition of God's will in my life, in all my life, in all life, and the loyal, continuous effort to make that will prevail. So the question is not "What can I do?" but "What can God and I do? What can God

do through me?" As the days come and the years go, this co-working of the soul with God provides an increasing harmony between the soul of man and the plan of God for that soul. This growing correspondence secures at last the attainment of complete divinity. "We shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is."

I have spoken twice, and strongly, of the achievement of a genuinely divine character. It may be objected that, after all, the Christian life is a very imperfect thing at best. To speak of attaining divinity approaches blasphemy. This is true if we limit the Christian life to that section of it which runs its course here upon earth. Jesus Christ sanctions no such limitation. The Christian life is not bounded by the narrow horizon of our earthly existence. It is an eternal life. The beginnings are here, the completions are yonder. The sapling need not fear the withering chill of the winter's breath. True, it has not yet attained, neither is already perfect. The fulness of its stature has not yet been won. The trunk is slender and the branches bear no fruit. But the winter does not end its opportunity for growth. Beyond is a springtime of rich promise, beyond a summer of rare and glorious development.

The Christian life is "cabined, cribbed, confined." But death does not end all. Through the opening vistas of immortality he shall pass on and upward to his own. He stands now in the midst of the ages, an heir to eternal life. More and more clearly will he see the face of God. More and more fully will he enter into correspondence with the will of God. More and more triumphantly will the Spirit of God clothe and empower him.

We are sometimes terribly conscious of our fleshly limitations. The negations and confusions of the self-life, the abnormal state, in which we have so long been enmeshed, still balk our best efforts at full fellowship with God. The insistent cry of our heart is, "Good Master, what must I do that I may inherit eternal life?" Doubts prevent us. Sins compel us. We are "children of wrath, even as others." Then, soft and low, the Saviour's voice is heard, "This is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hath sent."

Growth in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ is often regarded, in common with regeneration, as mystical, magical, abnormal, and utterly out of the realm of ordinary law. What a mistaken notion! The whole subject is obscured by the fact that so many lives which bear the name of Christian fail to



conform to the laws of normal growth. We study these. We hear the glowing testimony of their lips. We notice the morbid conscientiousness which seems to rule their actions. We observe their semi-ascetic habits. We detect some glaring abnormalities. We perhaps conclude that if these curious, visionary, most uncompanionable people are the elect of God, the true Christian life must be a state either of ecstasy, or of spectacular self-assertion, or of anxious foreboding and feverish self-searching, or of mystical surrender to some erratic and half-uncanny spirit of divination, or of fussy zeal in mechanical and external service, or of pious attention to the formal worship of the sanctuary. These anomalies of the Christian life have very often, in one or another of their many forms, been mistaken for its true expression. They have been exploited, wondered at, and eagerly sought, as essentials of spirituality. As a matter of fact, they are more apt to be symptoms of neurotic and degenerate states.

The Christian life, however, is always a life. It is a life full, large, free, buoyant, human, glorious. As we become simple and direct in our thinking, and as we study the high and true manifestations of the Christian life, we find we are not in the realm of the lawless, the prodigy-working and the erratic, but in that of the healthful, the sane, the well-balanced. We learn that true discipleship of Jesus is never fantastic. We learn that it is not predominantly emotional, but fundamentally ethical. It gives large room for noble enthusiasms, but none for unethical ebullitions, extravagances and eccentricities.

That the Christian life is the normal life is shown in *the ministry of Jesus Christ*. In the inner as in the outer life "order is heaven's first law." The predominant exercise of the intellect, the emotions of the will, produce a one-sided character. The due balance is preserved in Christ's teaching, and nowhere else so fully. "First the blade, then the ear, and then the full corn in the ear," is the method of Christian growth. We are to seek first things first, and first of all the kingdom of God and his righteousness; the other things will arrange themselves in orderly procession, if God and his righteousness control.

*The miracles* are chiefly restorations to a normal state. We call Christ lovingly "The Great Physician." Everywhere in his works of healing, explicit or implied, the recovery of bodily health is a symbol of the normal healthfulness of soul to which the gospel leads.

Bartimæus has found his eyes. They were things that looked like eyes, but the response to the light was lacking. Now the nerve quivers with life. The response is perfect, the adjustment is normal, the man sees. So everywhere weakness and impotence are calling for a strong deliverer. The paralytic has feet, but he cannot walk; the withered hand has no power; the deaf and dumb man has ears that hear not and lips that cannot speak; the lunatic has a brain, but its connections with the nerves of sense are disarranged and tangled hopelessly. Christ enters this hospital of confusions and paradoxes. Passing from man to man, he brings each sad and suffering body into perfect relation with the laws of physical well-being. The lazaretto becomes a health resort, the tomb a cathedral, the fever-haunt a home of joyous ministry.

So, indirectly, in the lesser miracles. The hungry multitudes go away satisfied. The listless, empty nets are filled with fish. Dismay and embarrassment give place to joy at the wedding feast.

So, passing from the least to the greatest, the Son of God, assailed and crucified, commands the grave and death to stand aside as he walks forth, arrayed in resurrection glory, and reveals the overlordship of the spiritual law in the control of human destiny. In this final and supreme miracle Christ does not destroy the operation of the normal order, but asserts the sovereignty of the higher law, and so enables all who enter into fellowship with him to conquer their last enemy and cry exultant, "Thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."

*The parables* bear witness also that the Christian life is normal. The good seed, falling into good soil, abundantly watered and fertilized, conforming to all natural laws and in consequence producing heavy harvests, is the symbol of the kingdom. The Good Samaritan, with heart unshriveled by the fires of pride, with sympathies unquenched by the narrowness of a false formalism, is the Master's model of a Christian. The leaven hidden in the meal, working in absolute obedience to the law of its existence, producing the healthful and nutritious loaf, is the Christ-spirit in the body of humanity, changing and sanctifying.

On the other hand, the rich farmer, short-sighted and foolish, antagonizing the laws of charity, of conscience and of character in the interest of mere material gain, and therefore smitten with sudden death, is the picture of the unregenerate. So, the judge who is unjust; the fig tree, bearing leaves, but no fruit; the spiritual

teacher, the Pharisee, rejoicing in a wooden religion of tithes and fasts, are essentially one-sided, twisted, ill-developed natures, and all are types of the unbeliever.

That the Christian life is the normal life receives a daily corroboration in *the experience of the Christian*. The testimony here is very conclusive.

The lame man, when he was healed, tried his limbs. He walked and leaped, and, finding himself whole and sound, he glorified God. So the new-born Christian manifests his spiritual vigor by appropriate signs. The sense of freedom, of control, of harmony amongst his soul's powers, urges his lips to benedictions and his heart to praise. The spirit of praise, indeed, is a constant phenomenon in the Christian life. It springs from a realization of the soul-health which distinguishes the normal life. The complete identification of the man with God's great purpose for his life expresses itself in the cry, "Bless the Lord, O my soul; and all that is within me, bless his holy name." The multitudinous experiences of the Christian life, in contrast with those of the unbeliever, are embodied in the tremendous statement that "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap; he that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting."

A physician—a brilliant man, but sadly intemperate—came to the place of sincere repentance. He said to me, "It's just this: I'm sick of sin, sick of sin." That man has for years now been living a sweet, serene and masterful Christian life. In such extreme cases one traces most clearly the effect of a return to normal conditions. We can, after all, find no wiser counsel than that contained in the succinct cry of the revivalist, "Get right with God." It is your daily and hourly experience, my brother, and it is mine, that to be right with God is to be sound, sane, normal in word and in action. The revivalist may often be untrue to his own counsel. That is neither here nor there. The point is that you and I, speaking out of the mouth of our successes and failures alike, have lived the rich and fruitful life just exactly to the extent that we, trusting in the Holy Spirit for guidance, have followed the very homely and very practical injunction of St. Paul, "Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honorable, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are

of good report—if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things.”

Finally, *the character of Jesus Christ* affords us overwhelming evidence that the Christian life is a normal life.

“*Ecce Homo!*” cries the moralist. “*Ecce Deus!*” cries the spiritualist. “*Ecce Homo ac Deus!*” cries the sinning, unsatisfied heart of humanity, longing for holiness. “He went about doing good.” What words could be more comprehensive, more complete? The spirit of the divine goodness flows out through every avenue of his being.

“Majestic sweetness sits enthroned  
Upon the Saviour’s brow.”

What grace of person, what sweep of vision, what passion of sympathy, what balance and poise, what largeness and wholeness and wholesomeness of life are here! Outbreaks of emotionalism are not here. The cold and logical presentation of a system of doctrine is not here. A businesslike and unspiritual zeal is not here. Yet his character is emotional, rational, practical. In him are all things, and by him all things consist, both human and divine. He is the Son of Man. He is “the brightness of the Father’s glory and the express image of his person.” In the very shadow of Calvary he prays, “Not my will, but thine, be done.” This ideal obedience to God’s perfect law is the apotheosis of the normal life in the midst of the common round of human duties. Each day that prayer of his must be our prayer. There in Gethsemane, there at Calvary, is our standard!

“O Jesus, King most wonderful,  
Thou Conqueror renowned,  
Thou sweetness most ineffable,  
In whom all joys are found,  
When once thou visitest the heart  
The truth begins to shine;  
Then worldly vanities depart,  
Then kindles love divine.”

The abnormal life is the life foredoomed to perish. The normal life is the everlasting life in Christ. He is “the Way, the Truth, the

Life." For "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but should have everlasting life."

THE PRESIDENT: The next speaker on this topic is Rev. Carter Helm Jones, D.D., of Louisville, Ky.

REV. CARTER HELM JONES: *Mr. President, Brothers and Sisters:* Coming as I do for the last word upon the program of the Congress, and thinking of it as an embodied and symmetrical whole, it seems to be my place, after the stately exordium of its beginnings, the noble exegeses of its texts, the Pauline analyses of its arguments, the Johannean spirituality and beauty of its amplifications—it seems, I say, to be my part to add the exhortation at the close of the sermon. My prayer is that I may not, with my poor self, eclipse the picture of the normal Christian life so beautifully portrayed. I would rather pronounce the benediction that comes after the complete, the powerful statement of the truth as it is in God's two revelations, the Book and nature.

I rejoice, as you all doubtless do, that in the last generation the accent religious has changed from the theological to the biological. We are not so much concerned with creedal statement, we are not so much concerned with the building up of ourselves in our more or less holy orthodoxy, as we are with life.

It is a strange thing that we should have been so long returning to the incarnation of religion in Jesus Christ; that so long we should have misrepresented before the world him who came to give life to men. The crimson currents ebbed and flowed through all the ages of life before Harvey explained the circulation of the blood. It is not a new discovery of modern theology that religion is life and not dogma; and what a short step it has been from the laboratory and the cloister and the library and the pulpit combined, which have given us the same views of religious teaching, to the fields where those blessed feet walked—yea, to the very bosom where we, too, as John, may come to be taught of God, of the great heart of Christ himself!

The Christian life is normal in its source. There is no more spontaneous generation in the religious life than there is in the natural life. The scientists have probably done us no finer service than when, without one religious predisposition, without the fear

of ecclesiastical hierarchy or inquisitorial court of opinion, in their laboratories they have exploded the doctrine which claimed that life could spring itself into being. Ye must be born from above. That is the dictum that speaks to the lower form of natural life from the higher form of real life; the word Jesus still speaks to childhood or to prodigal manhood, in hovel or in palace, in the Christian home or in the penitentiary—everywhere the same word comes, “Ye must be born again.” He that hath the Son hath life; he that hath not the Son hath not life. And this life is not only normal in its source, but it is normal in its support, in its growth. A natural life needs, we say in every-day terms, light and food and air and exercise. So does the spiritual or the Christian life.

When he, that Man of history and of allegory and of prophecy, opened his window toward Jerusalem, lo! we, too, can go into that chamber, and we, too, need to, often as he, far from the madding crowd, ignoble strife, shut the door and shut the great world, with its carking cares, its biting hate, its immanent envies, its awful threatenings or its seductive allurements, out, and, opening the window of ourselves toward our God, we need that there may beam through the window and into our souls that light of heaven which chases the shadows away, which floods every nook and corner of the heart with light, letting light into the miasma, the very suggestion of doubt.

It is so dark without God. And how many grope in a chosen darkness! We need that window to open, so that there may come in the breeze that blows from the eternal hills. How much of our piety is asphyxiated in the pent hot-house of unnatural living, existing, within which we have circumscribed ourselves! We need the ventilation of the soul, the fresh air borne by that Spirit that blows whither he listeth. We need that the window shall be opened that through it there may come voices from the eternal. The listening life is the normal life. Even as in the temple of old, Samuel-like, we, too, may listen for that voice, which, whoso hears, shall think of what has been and what shall be. Silent or hushed the din of rude music, the world’s dissonant clangings and the discordant insistence of its clamorous efforts, our soul, through the open window, can say, “Speak, Lord; thy servant heareth.”

The commerce with the sky: we sometimes call that prayer. How many people among us know what prayer is? We have fallen so often into that celestial beggary, that rushes as with a great market-

basket, crying aloud, "Give, give, give," that we go to God in the last extremity to give back some worthless life, or to get something which we have selfishly thought we need from his bounty. When the windows are open toward God, when the avenues toward the eternal are all clear, we learn what prayer means.

I was taught that lesson some seven or eight years ago. I had climbed 'way up into my study at the top of the house, under the roof—a fit place, perhaps, for a sky pilot, away from the stress and strain of life that shut me in—and I shut the door with a resounding slam; I did not want anything on earth to disturb me. There I was working; and presently I heard a tap on the door, then a louder, still a louder. Impatiently I went to the door—God forgive me!—I opened it impatiently, and I looked down into a pair of great brown eyes, and I said, "What do you want?" A little voice that quivered just then said, "Father, I have just come up to love you—that's all." And I clasped the little darling to my heart, and buried my face in his cool cheek, and felt the throb of his heart against my own, and knew that I was learning lessons that my old books could not teach me. And oh! I went back to my work thinking, if God is like as a father, does he not love, ever and anon, to hear his children climbing the great altar stair that slopes through darkness up to him and say to him, "Father, I have just come up to love you—that's all"? And in those moments of communion, in that holy symphony of heart-beat to heart, in that sweet fellowship of spirit with spirit, the soul grows, and the godly side of this thing we call life grows. Oh, that the window may always be open toward the Jerusalem of our spiritual lives!

But it needs exercise, too, this life that shall be known. Paul says very finely, using the athletic term: "Gymnasticize thyself unto godliness; exercise thyself unto godliness." Is it normal that we shall call out of the esoteric, the pent, the cribbed cabin of the confined life, toward the world? What a pity it is that men should have taken such a fine expression as "the higher life" and made it to express that which is abnormal and unreal and unreasonable and unearthly! They climb the mount before day, as those boys did at Northfield; they come down; and when a Mr. Moody meets them and asks them where they have been, they say to him: "Why do you ask? We have been all night on the mountain; do you not see our faces glisten?" And the great apostle of common-sense said, "Moses wist not that his face glistened."

How much of this so-called religion is a moral dyspepsia, and comes from an introspective morbidness, sickly or pale-faced piety! It feels its pulse, it takes its temperature, it compares itself with itself. It seeks all the time for religious reading, which means reading that corroborates rather than instructs; that reading that makes one—I hate the phrase, but I must use it—feel good, feel good. It develops that type of humanity which soon recognizes and becomes proud of itself. The Christian life has its manhood side as well as its Godhood side.

You remember that familiar and homely answer of the great Abraham Lincoln. He was asked one day, "Mr. Lincoln, how long do you think a man's legs ought to be?" "Well," said he, "I have not thought very much about the subject, but I should think they ought to be long enough to reach the ground." (Laughter.)

Oh, would that sickly, religious, sentimental namby-pambyism could learn that not cold gazing after an ascended Christ, not the affluence of sublimated tides of transcendental emotion, bright with star dust, is the program for religious life, but that their feet must be upon the ground, and that they must live an every-day life! Or, as Wordsworth would put it, in another connection: The Christian life must not be "too bright and good for human nature's daily food."

Jesus Christ was God's tangent with humanity. Jesus Christ intended that every follower of his should be in turn his tangent with the humanity that should follow him. He did not come to be admired of men; he did not come to sing himself a beautiful song that should enrapture, as the prelude to the symphony of a beautiful life fell upon the listening air of night and woke the shepherds o'er Bethlehem's hills; he did not come to be a wonderful picture which men should gaze upon and weep over and think over; he did not come to be a magnificent orator whose words should enthrall, speaking as never man spoke, and then go away; he did not come to advertise himself the sovereign of humanity, even that he might be the king in the pantheons of all earthly gods and godlings; he did not come that men might imitate him; he did not come that men might worship him. Yet never has Jesus Christ been presented to any audience from the first century till now that men did not give the involuntary obeisance, bowed the heads and hushed the hearts in his presence.

In that literary company, when they were wondering what they



would do if the great men of the world should suddenly appear in their midst, some one said, "And what if he, Jesus Christ, should come?" And Charles Lamb stuttered out, amid that brilliant coterie: "We said just now if Shakespeare should come we would all stand; if He should come we would all kneel."

But what has Jesus Christ been to the dreaming Pilates' wives of humanity, the painter of his pictures, the singer of his songs, the weaver of rhetorical garlands which they fain would make to adorn his temple? Like the fame from a far-off echo.

No; as I said, Jesus Christ was God's tangent with men. He came not only to live and love and teach, but he came that by his death he might transfuse his blood into the blood of humanity; that he might enter into the tides of their lives. He asks not for the nod of condescending admiration; he asks not for the fealty of formal profession; he asks not for the worship of an occasional offering. He gave all; he asks for all, and nothing else will do. He asks for the life of men. It is well to quote the heathen, "I am man, and therefore nothing human is foreign to me"; but Jesus said it with lordlier dignity and simplicity when he said, "I am the son of humanity, the son of man."

And so the doctrine of reincarnation is the normal life, which is a successive life, as Jesus Christ through his Holy Spirit shall give life with the coming and going of the days. It is not only normal in its growth and in its sustaining, but it is normal also in its expression. We are to translate life into deed; we are to translate faith into works. That splendid paradox of the Apostle Paul is learning its full expression in our days, "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling, for it is God that is working in you both the willing and doing, according to his good pleasure." Salvation by grace from sin and death and hell; salvation by works from littleness, narrowness, ugliness, stinginess, selfishness; salvation by works into symmetry, beauty, harmony, knowledge, culture, sympathy—God.

It seems to me but yesterday, and yet more than a score of years have elapsed; I am sitting in memory in the little, old, dingy Latin theology classroom at Louisville, before the stately hall in which our successors studied had been built. The great teacher had just opened with us the Confessions of Augustine, and there, in beautiful red letters, the most famous sentence lies before me. It was one of the epochal moments of life, and as I translated it simply, how

it has stood before me since: "O God, thou hast made us for thyself, and we are restless till we rest in thee." As beautifully unfolded by the former essayist, the sweetest story ever told was the story of an abnormal boy that came to himself, and then came to his home; the two go together.

This life is normal in its demands—normal in its demands. The parable of the talents is, to my mind, the finest practical manual of business or of conduct in all literature, and the key sentence to the parable of the talents is: Mine own with interest; mine own with interest; mine own, that which I lent thee, plus its earned increment in the market which we call life. It is Christ's call to culture, and the Christian life through Jesus Christ is constantly calling to the physical, mental, spiritual—all the powers of man—to develop themselves in the world where they live: I pray not that thou shouldst take them out of the world, but that thou shouldst keep them from evil. I am come, was his most splendid enunciation—I am come that ye might have life, and have it more abundantly.

Oh, how glad I am that the days of Puritanism have passed; how glad I am that the days when religion went sour-visaged and sad-countenanced and long-faced and gloomy along the narrow border of what they called a howling wilderness have passed! How glad I am that in the name of the Captain of Salvation, in the name of the God of the beautiful, and the God of the strong, and the Redeemer of this whole world, we have taken music and art and beauty and books, and all learning and all life, and joy and buoyancy and childhood, from the devil, and stamped them all with this sign manual of the Cross! I never see anything that is beautiful, anything that is strong, anything that is glorious in promise, that I do not feel what I believe is divine jealousy; I want it captured, evangelized, for Jesus Christ.

The demands are normal that come upon a Christian's life, that it should be the highest, richest, strongest, most gracious, most beautiful, most conquering life that it is possible for that life to be. The Christian life is lived normally in the two worlds, with that magnificent reserve which comes from the mysterious and unseen but supernatural connection with God himself. The Christian can always be like a bird, one moment lighted upon a twig that swings—he feels it yield, yet sings on unafraid, knowing he hath his wings; and in that fine certainty, whether the way seems lowly or heaven-kissed and transfigured in beauty; whether in the way we hear the

music of the plaudits of the thousands, or whether it is a foundation work in the silence and the darkness, it matters not, so God's work is done. And sometimes I think that in that quaint and Kipling-esque style he has said the word that some hearts are waiting to hear :

“When life's last picture is painted,  
And the tubes are all twisted and dried;  
When the oldest colors are faded,  
And the youngest critic has died:  
Then we rest in faith—we shall need it;  
Sit down for a year or two,  
Till the Master of all good workmen  
Shall set us to work anew.  
And none but the Master shall praise us,  
And none but the Master shall blame,  
And no one shall work for money,  
And no one shall work for fame;  
But each for the joy of the working,  
And each in his separate star,  
Shall draw the thing as he sees it,  
For the God of the things as they are.”

I saw a telegram from Louisville this morning, and it gave me pause. A very celebrated Italian actor left the plaudits and praises of the footlights many years ago and went to Oberammergau, and there patiently and lovingly prepared himself to impersonate Jesus Christ in the great Passion Play. I think it more than likely that some of you saw him; that part of the world was bursting with his success. But, oh, the pity of it! He came to Louisville, and yesterday went out and paused for a moment while God's beautiful sunlight kissed him, and God's orchestra of birds sang to him, and God's great, yearning, weary-hearted world, with tasks, called to him, and then stepped into Gethsemane, there to stay until death shall call him. Oh, the pity of it! the pity of it! “I pray not that thou shouldst take them out of the world, but that thou shouldst keep them from the evil.”

It is one thing to impersonate Jesus Christ, but it is a grander thing to personify him. Oh, that we could reach that point in the normal life when, with Paul, we could say, “For me to live is

Christ"! "I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live; yet not I—Christ liveth in me. And the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me."

I say it is normal in its demands. It is demanding as never before that the salt of the earth shall be applied to the corruption of society; that the light of the world shall shine, not borne by angel torch-bearers, or archangels, with the candelabra of a new-made hierarchy, but that we, too, shall come to him and learn what it means when John says, "In Him was life, and the life was the light of men." Oh, to go into the professions and ennoble and marry Law and Equity in the indissoluble union of a perfect match! Oh, to go into politics and let them no longer be bound together by the cohesive power of public plunder, but to take into politics a conscience that shall be a monitor and not an accomplice! Oh, to get under the great burdens of the world and translate the divine things into the human terms of living, every-day service!

It is a normal life, too, because it has been beautifully expressed. I wanted to be here day before yesterday and yesterday; but as I was leaving for the train God called me into a chamber. It was like a flash of lightning out of the clear sky. A beautiful maid, standing with reluctant feet where the broken rivers meet, had been smitten with an incurable disease subtly evading the diagnosis of physicians; and when they called me she had lapsed into coma. But as I went in the family were gathered about her. I spoke to her and she lifted her eyes. I took her hand and breathed a prayer to God, and with it a passage of Scripture. Then there came upon her face the light that never was upon sea or land, and the cold fingers pressed mine, and the glorified face opened and the lips whispered, "I know, I know; heaven, heaven," and the prayer had wafted the soul out upon that tide, and presently her anchor was dropped in the port of perfect peace. No; silence may shiver upon the chasm of the unknowable, and it may never fling one ray across the darkness; but you and I, with faith in Him who is the resurrection and the life, can say: "I know in whom I have believed, and I am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day."

May I in parting, not to play upon words, though Jesus often did so, say that it is rather an interesting thing that this word "normal," of which we are speaking, after all, comes from the word, the Latin

word *norma*; and *norma* means rule, carpenter's square and carpenter's rule; and, after all, is not that the key to the whole matter? If our life is to be normal, we must find the steps of the carpenter of Nazareth, and the carpenter's rule must be the way we tread. The sweetest epitome of his life, perhaps, was to me on the day he said: "I must work the works of him that sent me while it is day." The night cometh when no man can work, and when the shadows gather about us. Death does not put a period of darkness at the bottom of the page we call time; it is simply a comma, and we turn the leaf "till the day breaks and the shadows flee away." (Applause.)

THE PRESIDENT: *Brethren*: I had not supposed that I would have to make any further remarks to you, but after this morning's session the Secretary came to me with his finger on that short line of the program which reads, "Closing Words," and said, "You have noticed that?" "Yes," I said. "Well, you are expected to lead off, you know." I said I did not know any such thing—that I had not been informed that I was expected to say anything further. He opened to me the minutes of the last Congress and showed me that the president last year had made a closing speech, and said that that had been the custom, and, moreover, that it was expected. Necessarily I had to yield, because he furnished documentary evidence as well as gave me the consensus of opinion.

Now, these are two principles which have impressed me during these meetings as important for this Congress to observe, as well as for all the rest of us. When any one can put his finger on the word and say, "Thus saith the indisputable authority," and back this up by the consensus of opinion of the wise and good of other times and places, that should make an overwhelming proof impossible of contradiction. I cannot see why any one wants to go back and unsettle that which has already been settled perhaps for the thousandth time, and for a thousand years, and which has been verified as good and wholesome by generations of the wisest and the best of men. There are some things that are fundamental and indisputable; let us not spend our time and energies and work up our souls into a fever of anguish about them. Why do we wish to discover anew the foundations, or seek to pull out and examine and relay the pieces in that foundation? It only tends to weaken and endanger the whole structure. Leaving the first principles, the well-established and tried of centuries, let us go on to perfection, spend our lives and our ener-

gies, our thought and soul power, to carrying these accepted principles forward to their highest and best fruitage.

I fear this Congress has partaken somewhat of the character of this city. This city, as said to you before, is fairly bursting through its corporate limits and running wild into the fields beyond. Some of our brethren seem to think that the corporate limits of our Zion are too confined, and chafe against the restriction. They evidently long to break away and to run forth into the unfenced fields beyond. Brethren, there is room upward. Be like our skyscrapers; because they cannot spread outward on the ground they rise upward, far toward the clouds; and the narrower the foundations, often the higher the building goes, and the more room is found above. To get freedom, you do not need to spread outward, but to rise upward. Your freedom is unlimited in that direction. May you ever strive to seek relief by struggling higher and higher toward the light and the heights of God's truth.

I have heard a good deal here that would lead us to conclude that we have changed our conditions so much that there must be a change of attitude in reference to truth; that we must have new truth; that the old will no longer apply, or at least that we must have a new treatment and give to the old new aspects; that what was good for a hundred or a thousand years ago will not do for this age of steam and electricity and for all the new appliances of civilization. I do not believe mere outer conditions alter the great fundamental facts of human nature and human needs. Dr. Strong told me not long since of a little lesson he learned from one of the lady teachers of Vassar. After the commencement day exercises, which showed in a gratifying manner the intellectual attainments of the graduates, walking down the aisle of the chapel with this teacher, he said: "Are you not afraid, as sometimes accused, that you will so develop the intellects of these young ladies that they will lose all taste for marriage and the domestic life?" And she said that she would reply by telling a little story in which she was personally involved. She said last summer she visited an old uncle in New England, who, in a rural place, had become quite an important manufacturer of furniture. He took great pleasure in showing her around through his factories and warehouses. There was one storehouse that seemed to be completely filled with nothing but chairs, and she said to him: "Why, Uncle Zeke, are you not greatly overstocked with chairs?" He replied: "Never you worry, Marier; it

will be a long while before settin' down will go out of fashion." I say to you that it will be a long while before human nature will go out of fashion. As it was in Adam, so is it to-day, and so will it be to the end of time. The human soul has the same needs under all stages of civilization, and it requires the same method and the same set of truths to save the soul.

Perhaps you have read in a recent number of one of our leading magazines that wonderful story of a recent find in Egypt—the opening of a tomb that had been sealed before the time of Moses, in which there was a chamber filled with furniture and the utensils of that house from which the dead were carried. If you have seen the pictures illustrating these articles, you will be surprised to find how almost exactly they are like the chairs and the beds and the cooking utensils of to-day. The very bedstead is like the one on which you slept last night, and our best patterns of chairs are but the reproduction of those of four thousand years ago. And who of you that have read the stories told by the tablets unearthed in Babylon and the papyrus in Egypt have not been profoundly impressed with the fact that human thought and emotion, social conditions and relations, have been practically the same from the earliest times to the present?

Another thing: I have been surprised to find how awfully profound and abstruse have become the truths of God, which we used to think were simple enough for a child to apprehend. Once it was written "He that runs may read." Now it seems to be written "He that reads may run," so almost awful have become these truths. They fairly frighten us and cause us to flee away from them. Surely, brethren, we need to come back to the simplicity of Christ and know once more that the way is so plain that a wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein. Jesus to-day, in the midst of all these philosophical and scientific questions, is the only relief for the bewildered mind and the troubled soul. You remember the bitter controversy of the Wesleys with Toplady. After their struggles to make each other comprehend and accept their relative positions on the abstruse questions of divine sovereignty and man's free will, Charles Wesley turned away and relieved his sore heart by writing that hymn we so often sing:

"Jesus, lover of my soul,  
Let me to thy bosom fly."

And Toplady turned away and wrote that other hymn which is equally a favorite:

"Rock of Ages, cleft for me,  
Let me hide myself in thee."

I trust that as a result of the discussions in this Congress of the difficult questions for our consideration we may be led to turn all the more eagerly to him who is our Lord and Saviour, our Loving Friend. And may this prove to be like that mount where the disciples "saw no man save Jesus only." (Applause.)

THE PRESIDENT: Now, Dr. Lasher, I understand, is expected to speak to us on behalf of the Local Committee.

DR. LASHER: *Mr. President:* It affords me pleasure to speak on behalf of the Local Committee. The committee is not large and it has not all been present during these meetings. One of the members of the committee, upon whom we relied most largely for service in preparation for your coming, was taken unwell soon after we began work and has not been able to leave his home since, so that we missed him entirely. A few of us have been very much engaged in other things and have been unable to give as much attention to this particular work as we had thought we might under other circumstances, but we have enjoyed doing the work very greatly.

Those brethren who had never attended one of these congresses, had only heard of them, the national Congress having produced a very strong impression on their minds, have stood in some awe of it, thinking that we should welcome to us the mighty men of our denomination and that the committee would have a great responsibility in caring for these men and making them feel that they had been properly attended to during their sojourn. So they have stood in some considerable awe of the Congress; but as you have come to us in the spirit and the assurance which we have found in you, we have cherished but little of that, and now feel exceedingly glad that it has been our privilege to meet you and greet you and seek to care for you during these days.

When I first went to the President of this Congress to ask him about accepting the position to which we had chosen him he rather objected, on the ground that he was fearful of the outcome of these



congresses; that he had not seen, in times past, evidence that so much good was to come from these meetings as he wished might come. And I assured him that, in my judgment, there was no particular danger; that it was the idea of the Congress that those who came should be free to speak their minds, and that nobody was responsible for what was said here except the man who said it; and in that view of the case he thought it was possible for him to sit on the platform and listen with patience and with a degree of composure during the time, and he has vindicated that conception of it very well. I have noticed sometimes that he was a little uneasy; sometimes he couldn't keep his seat very well—he would find his way round this way and round that way; somehow he was a little uneasy, but, nevertheless, he has endured and is in very good condition even at this hour; and I am glad you haven't done him any more harm than he has experienced.

For my own part, I have had very conflicting emotions during the time, sometimes on the heights and sometimes in the valley; and I have heard things that seemed to me to belong to both ends of the gallery, some things that to me seemed to be undermining Christianity, other things that seemed to be on the very mountain-top of the things of the kingdom; and I have rejoiced in the latter and have resolved that by the grace of God I would try to endure the former. On the whole I believe that the Congress has been wholesome and, I trust, profitable to us all. I think we shall be stronger in some directions, and we shall remember with pleasure the things that have borne us along, and be glad we are Christian men and women.

I feel that the Baptist denomination is, on the whole, honored by the Congress; that our brethren who have spoken have quite correct notions, and on the whole it has not been a hindrance but a help to us. I do not know how the generation after us will construe these things; it may modify the methods of procedure somewhat, but I think possibly this work may continue for a considerable time. However that may be, we wish there were more of you. Those who came early have gone; we are glad you came; we enjoyed our part of the work, and we trust you will go away with pleasant memories of Cincinnati, the Walnut Hills Church, and the sisters who have been so much interested in all that has been done. We rejoiced in your coming and bid you Godspeed in your going. We pray God's blessing may rest upon you and that you will be stronger men for

the work to which you are called. May God bless you, and the memory remain with us, as we believe it will, for years to come. (Applause.)

THE PRESIDENT: The next speaker is Rev. S. Z. Batten, who will speak on behalf of the General Committee.

REV. S. Z. BATTEN: *Mr. President and Brethren:* It has been a very great privilege for the members of the General Committee to meet in this splendid city of the East, and I think it has been a privilege—I hope you will forgive the word—it has been a privilege on your part to entertain the Congress. I think this Congress is well worth while; it has justified itself abundantly in having brought forth two such magnificent addresses as we have had this afternoon. If it had done nothing more than that, I think it would have justified itself this year.

You must not always judge of the greatness of an institution by the number of its members. I find there are about two hundred and fifty members of the General Committee. I think there ought to be ten times that number; yet those are the facts in the case for the present. I am willing to admit that a baby elephant is a great deal bigger than my little boy, but I am just as strenuous in the claim that my little boy is a great deal greater than the baby elephant. So, while the Congress, in a way, may seem comparatively small, I believe it is a great thing; it has done great things for our Baptist denomination. For one thing, it has broken up the monotony of our life. We get into ruts, all of us, and stay in ruts, and we get pretty rutty after a while; and anything that will break up the monotony of life, give us new ideas—and Mr. Moody said he would go five hundred miles any day to get a new idea—anything that will give us new ideas, teach us to look at truth from another man's point of view, is a good thing.

I remember hearing of a man from the West who went East some time ago, and he was talking to a native in a village there, and it seemed to him the life of that community was very monotonous; and so he said, "What do you do here?" "Well," the man said, "in the evening we go around to the grocery store, and sometimes we set and think, and sometimes we just set." (Laughter.) You needn't be afraid if you strike a light—the universe is fireproof. Anything you say that will break up the monotony of life is a good thing. Break up the monotony of our denominational life—Baptist

life; it is a good thing. I believe the Baptist Congress has saved a great many strong men for the Baptist party. If you look back twenty years you will find we have lost comparatively few strong men in that time who have leaped over the traces and gone to find larger liberty in some other body. But before the Congress was organized you will find we lost a good many strong men that ought never to have been lost to this body; they should have remained, and might have remained, I believe, if this Baptist Congress were fifty years older. It has saved these men, for one thing. You know, when a man gets hold of an idea, or an idea gets hold of him, sometimes a man feels that somebody is trying to repress him, interfere with his liberty, and the man and the idea don't get along very well. You have heard the story of the English preacher who one morning complained of feeling poorly and said he couldn't preach. Well, the deacon said, "I think you had better preach; you will feel better after the sermon, I guess." So he went through with the service; and then the deacon said, "How do you feel now?" "Well, I feel very well—better." "Well, I knew you would feel better when you got that sermon out of your system." (Laughter.) It will do these men good to express themselves; they hadn't been able before this Baptist Congress was organized without bringing down the heavens upon themselves. Now, this Congress has vindicated the right of free speech. I believe it has vindicated that right within the Baptist body; that is to say, it has simply illustrated our Baptist principles. We say our fundamental Baptist principle is liberty of interpretation. Then let us be consistent, and let us have a Baptist Congress where a man may speak out his thought, and some other man have the privilege of exposing the falsity of his own.

I remember speaking to a man in New York City—a Presbyterian. He spoke of their troubles, and in speaking of the Baptist Congress he said, "If we had a Presbyterian Congress like the Baptists' it would have been the making of us." And I believe our Baptist Congress has saved us from a great many difficulties during these years.

Now, just a word about the future. We hope that the next session of the Baptist Congress may meet in Lincoln, Neb. Let me say, brethren, I believe it will do us good out there to have the people see some of our public men, see how large they are, and to know what some of our public people are thinking. I believe it

will do the people good in that section of the world to have the Baptist Congress meet there. Let me say this, also: I am inclined to think it will do some of you good to come out into that part of the world and see what a world we have out there. I come from the heart of the great American Desert land. In that part of the State they are selling farm land at one hundred and twenty-five dollars an acre. I could tell a good many stories about the West. A Western man talked with an Eastern man, and he was telling big things about the West—and a Western man always tells the truth; it may be a little large sometimes, but it is always true. So the Eastern man didn't express any surprise; and finally the Western man said, "You don't seem to be surprised about anything I tell you; you must have lived in the West yourself." "Oh, no." "Well, how is it?" "Well, the fact is, I am something of a liar myself."

Well, just take one illustration—only one: The entire gold output last year, including Alaska, was only about \$80,000,000; our golden corn crop this year from the State of Nebraska alone was worth \$120,000,000. The gold output of Colorado was \$24,000,000; we got out creamery products of \$25,000,000. And as to climate, we have the best climate the Lord ever made, out there—that is to say, with exceptions. It is like most people—good in spots. But we have more sunshine than Italy by actual count. We hope you will come out to that part of the world; it will do you good.

Just this one word: It seems to me this afternoon we have a blessed illustration of our Baptist life; we have been looking at truth from different angles of observation, but, after all, we trust we have been seeking the light. We have had our faces toward the Lord Jesus Christ, that we might know him better, that knowing him better we might love him more, and that loving him more we might be more devoted in his service.

I like the story told of Mr. Robert Owen: how one day, in writing to a friend, he was about to write the words "You are called to be a Christian," and he had written "You are called to be a Christ—" when he was called away. He came back, took up his pen to finish; but he said, "No, that is as it stands—you are called to be Christ." Yes; we are called to continue the life of Jesus Christ, to incorporate the life in our age, in our place. It is a great thing to be a Baptist—a Baptist Christian—and so I think that because of this meeting we will go away rejoicing in the privilege of being a Baptist and, above everything, in the privilege of being a Christian loving this Christ.

following him until that day when we shall no longer see through a glass darkly, but face to face. (Applause.)

THE PRESIDENT: Dr. Gessler will now speak in behalf of the Executive Committee.

THEO. A. K. GESSLER, D.D.: *Mr. President:* If I should say all that has crowded itself into my mind while I have been listening to the addresses which have followed the topical presentations of the afternoon you wouldn't get away from here much before eight o'clock to-night. I want to say just a few things, and have put my watch before my eyes so that its movement will preserve me from overtaxing your patience.

In response to the suggestion which has been made concerning the possible perils which accompany the life of the Baptist Congress, let me just read to you a succession of names of men who have been identified with its life—names which, should I continue to read, would occupy about three hours in the reading, but of which I will only read about a half-dozen in the order in which they follow: George Dana Boardman, Henry G. Weston, William E. Hatcher, the Hon. J. L. M. Curry, Alva Hovey, Thomas Armitage, the Hon. William S. Holman. So I might go on. All these men have been actively identified with the work of this Congress, some of them giving to it their very best thoughts and their tenderest sympathy from the time of its inception to the close of their lives. George Dana Boardman, our first President, never ceased to speak of it as one of the most valuable institutions of our denomination. Wisely or otherwise, for the last ten years, since I have ceased from the more active efforts of the pastorate, I have found my highest joy in giving to the work of this Congress a large part of my time. And I say to you in all frankness, my friends, that I sincerely believe the work which I have been privileged under God to do here, in helping to gather together these best thoughts of our best thinkers, will be more valuable to the denomination and the Christian life of the world than the thirty years that I spent in the active pastorate, notwithstanding the great joy that I have in remembering the positive good wrought directly there upon human souls. That is my estimate, in a word, of the value of this Congress.

The world is moving. We are not living as we used to live. We have locomotives, trolley cars, automobiles; we live in a succession of changes in the mechanical world; surgery is revolutionized to-day—it is a different thing entirely from when the church in Valley

Forge was filled full to the lintels with the legs and arms of the fellows who had had them amputated after a battle of the Revolution. There is not any science in the world that has not undergone an absolute transformation. Theology must progress or die. I didn't come to all this easily. My first fight in the active ministry was against the theory of evolution, and one of the most elaborate papers I ever prepared was written against an article Mr. Beecher had written on "The Progress of Thought in the Church." I fought evolution with all the power that was in me; there wasn't a single thing Hegel or Spencer wrote that I didn't read. I read each scientific treatise for the purpose of combating it. You all know if I had to write to-day I would be compelled to write exactly the opposite thing. And these advances in the scientific world—oh, if they could all be put under a bushel and out of the way somewhere, so that our church members would know nothing about them; if the knowledge of biblical criticism could only be hidden away, so that the people would never know of it, and we could lead them as the Roman Catholics lead the people in their Church, believing that ignorance is the mother of devotion!—we could take the old theories of Christian doctrine, the old theories of Christian life, and sit down in sweet confidence that we and our people were getting along in the heavenly journey without any special thought about the way of getting there. Religion would be a little mechanical, it is true, but it wouldn't be disturbed.

But our boys are going to college now; there isn't a man in this Church, Mr. President, who has money enough to send his boy to college, that won't send him there. Now, then, when that boy comes home from college with the truths he has learned, do you put him into a pew in front of an old doctrinally encrusted, hide-bound creature, who is delivering over again the sermons he wrote twenty years ago? Do you think you are going to accomplish anything good with that boy by such a presentation? He knows better than the man who is trying to instruct him. This condition of incongruity is partly what is the matter to-day with the Christian world.

I notice you have an eminent evangelist down here in your town. What does it mean—that you are thus trying to patch up the inefficiencies of your existing institutions? No city in the land is doing what it ought, and what it needs to do, in order to keep its place in the ratio of church membership to the population. We have lost in that regard in the State of New York; our ratio of church membership there doesn't begin to be, in any denomination

except the Episcopal alone, what it was thirty or forty years ago. This suggests that there must be a readjustment somewhere, and I believe it is coming along these lines, toward which God is directing the consecrated thinkers of our day.

I don't believe everything is true because it is new; neither do I think everything is bad because it is old. But many things spoil with age, and theology is the worst of all in this regard. Now, a word for the Executive Committee. It is composed of fifteen members residing in or near New York City, first among whom I may be permitted to name our Chairman for many years, Dr. Henry M. Sanders, as *primus inter pares*. They change from time to time as men remove and their places are supplied by other brethren who move into the vicinity. They meet frequently every year, and work laboriously for the good of the Congress; and on their behalf I want to thank you, Mr. President, for the courteous manner in which you have presided over our deliberations. I desire also to thank the pastor of this church and the ladies of this church for the kindly efforts they have made in the direction of hospitality. I desire to thank, on behalf of the committee, the Baptists of this great city for all they have done to make our stay here as pleasant and as delightful as it has been. I wish to thank the Local Committee, the President of which addressed us to-night, for their careful and painstaking arrangements for the success of this Congress, and with an earnest prayer that God himself may give us the light that shall enable us always to discriminate between that which is true and that which is false, and that he may forever preserve us from inhospitality toward the greater light which he designs continually to send into our hearts, I say good-night. (Applause.)

THE PRESIDENT: We will sing the doxology, after which Dr. Pollard will lead us in prayer.

#### PRAYER.

REV. DR. E. B. POLLARD: In these closing moments, our Heavenly Father, we would turn to thee in gratitude. We bless thee for the fellowship with thy love, and the fellowship with one another. We thank thee for thy truth, and for all that it has brought to us through the years: above all, for Jesus Christ, whose mind we seek. Give us the normal life, the life hid with Christ in God, for truly our hearts are restless till they rest in Thee. Let thy blessing be with this church and its pastor, and with the good people of this great city, and grant that we may each one take to our homes the blessed influences of thy grace and of thinking thy thoughts, and may the kingdoms of this world become the Kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ. It is in His name that we ask it. Amen.

(ADJOURNED.)

## MEETINGS OF THE BAPTIST CONGRESS

---

DATE.	PLACE.	PRESIDENT.
1882.....	Brooklyn.....	George Dana Boardman, D.D.
1883.....	Boston.....	Alvah Hovey, D.D.
1884.....	Philadelphia.....	Henry G. Weston, D.D.
1885.....	New York.....	Thomas Armitage, 'D.D.
1886.....	Baltimore.....	William E. Hatcher, D.D.
1887.....	Indianapolis.....	Hon. William S. Holman, Jr.
1888.....	Richmond.....	Hon. J. L. M. Curry, LL.D.
1889.....	Toronto.....	Hon. David Mills, M.P.
1890.....	New Haven.....	Hon. Francis Wayland, LL.D.
1892.....	Philadelphia.....	Col. Charles H. Banes.
1893.....	Augusta.....	Gov. William J. Northen.
1894.....	Detroit.....	Pres. A. G. Slocum, LL.D.
1895.....	Providence.....	Pres. E. B. Andrews, LL.D.
1896.....	Nashville.....	Pres. J. T. Henderson, A.M.
1897.....	Chicago.....	Adin A. Kendrick, D.D.
1898.....	Buffalo.....	H. P. Emerson, Esq.
1899.....	Pittsburg.....	D. B. Purinton, LL.D.
1900.....	Richmond.....	A. P. Montague, LL.D.
1901.....	New York.....	Prof. A. S. Bickmore, Ph.D.
1902.....	Boston.....	Pres. D. W. Abercrombie, LL.D.
1903.....	Philadelphia.....	Russell H. Conwell, D.D., LL.D.
1904.....	Louisville.....	Jos. Benson Marvin, M.D., LL.D.
1905.....	Cincinnati.....	Gershom M. Peters, A.M.

---

NOTE.—The Fall session of 1891 was transferred to the Spring of 1892. This has left the year 1891 without any report.





## Topical Index

---

- Accepted Standards, How Far May One Depart from Them and Remain a Baptist? 1904. Rev. Geo. H. Ferris; Prof. Geo. B. Eager, D.D.; Rev. John L. Jackson; Rev. D. T. Denman.
- Amusements, Attitude of the Church Towards. 1887. Rev. C. H. Watson; T. T. Eaton, D.D.; E. A. Woods, D.D.; Kerr B. Tupper, D.D.
- Arbitration, International. 1896. Hon. Morton B. Howell.
- Architecture, Church. 1883. Rev. C. J. Baldwin; J. R. Thomas, Esq.
- Are the Teachings of the Apostles of Equal Authority with Those of Christ? 1897. Prof. E. D. Burton, D.D.; Dean W. P. McKee; Prof. Rush Rhees; Prof. C. L. Williams.
- Art, Christian, in Relation to Baptism. 1885. Pres. E. Dodge, D.D., LL.D.
- Authoritative Creeds. 1899. See Creeds.
- Authority, Source of, in Protestantism. See Protestantism.
- Authority of Teachings of Christ and the Apostles. 1897. Prof. E. D. Burton; Dean W. P. McKee; Prof. Rush Rhees; Prof. C. L. Williams.
- Baptism, What Constitutes Valid? 1893. J. Judson Taylor, D.D.; Rev. E. B. Pollard, Ph.D.; J. B. Moody, D.D.
- Baptism, Is it Essential to Church Membership? 1902. Rufus P. Johnston, D.D.; T. E. Busfield, D.D.; Rev. A. J. Bonsall; Rev. James Grant.
- Baptism, Is it Prerequisite to the Lord's Supper? 1897. O. P. Gifford, D.D.; P. S. Henson, D.D.; R. H. Conwell, D.D.
- Baptism of the Holy Spirit. 1895. Rev. F. L. Chappell; H. M. Sanders, D.D.
- Baptist, How Far May One Depart from Accepted Standards and Remain One? 1904. See Accepted Standards.
- Baptist Congress, Historical Sketch of. 1883. Albert G. Lawson, D.D.
- Baptist Doctrine and Church Life, Tradition as a Formative Force in. See Tradition.
- Baptist Polity, Centralization in. 1895. J. T. Christian, D.D.; Cephas B. Crane, D.D.; D. W. Faunce, D.D.
- Baptists, Union of Various Bodies of. 1892. B. B. Tyler, D.D.; A. H. Lewis, D.D.; J. A. Howe, D.D.; Prof. W. H. Whitsitt, D.D.
- Baptists, How Can They Secure for Themselves a More Practical, Working Union? 1903. See Union.
- Baptists, The Opportunity for, in Present Religious Progress. See Opportunity.
- Baptists, Relation of, to Other Denominations. 1896. L. A. Crandall, D.D.; Rev. J. O. Rust; Norman Fox, D.D.

- Believer, Power of the Cross in the Life of. 1897. J. T. Dickinson, D.D.; Donald D. MacLaurin, D.D.
- Believer, Union of, with Christ. 1898. Rev. A. C. Barbour.
- Believers, Priesthood of All. 1899. Rev. C. H. Pendleton; Geo. E. Rees, D.D.
- Benevolence and Current Church Expenses. 1885. H. H. Lamport, Esq.
- Bible, The English, in Education. 1884. Pres. J. A. Broadus, D.D., LL.D.
- Bible, Inerrancy of. 1892. Rev. T. A. T. Hanna; Prof. D. C. Lyon, Ph.D.; J. B. G. Pidge, D.D.; Prof. Howard Osgood, D.D.
- Bible, Inspiration of. 1886. O. P. Eaches, D.D.
- Bible, Relative Authority of. 1892. Pres. D. J. Hill, LL.D.; Prof. W. N. Clarke, D.D.; Pres. E. G. Robinson, D.D., LL.D.; Prof. A. T. Robertson.
- Bible, Use in Public Worship. 1884. T. T. Eaton, D.D.
- Biblical Criticism, Modern. 1883. T. J. Conant, D.D.; Pres. D. J. Hill, LL.D.; Prof. D. G. Lyon, Ph.D.; Prof. Howard Osgood, D.D.; J. A. Smith, D.D.
- Biblical Books, The, On What Grounds Should We Accept Them as Our Bible? 1898. B. O. True, D.D.; Geo. E. Merrill, D.D.; Rev. Geo. H. Ferris.
- Biblical Criticism. See Old Testament.
- Books of the New Testament in the Light of Modern Research. 1895. Rev. B. D. Hahn; P. A. Nordell, D.D.; Prof. Milton G. Evans, D.D.
- Canonicity of N. T. Books. 1895. Rev. B. D. Hahn.
- Centralization in Baptist Polity. 1895. J. T. Christian, D.D.; Cephas B. Crane, D.D.; D. W. Faunce, D.D.
- Charities. 1882. J. M. Gregory, LL.D.; Francis Wayland, LL.D.
- Children and the Church. See Church.
- Child Nurture in Baptist Polity. 1900. W. C. P. Rhoades, D.D.
- Christ and Apostles, Relative Authority of Teaching. 1897. See "Are the Teachings," etc.
- Christ as Example. 1902. A. K. Fuller, D.D.; Rush Rhees, LL.D.
- Christ, Oneness in. See Oneness in Christ.
- Christ, The Indwelling. 1893. Rev. Carter Helm Jones.
- Christ the Liberator; Christ the Unifier. 1894. Z. Grenell, D.D.; C. J. Baldwin, D.D.
- Christian Consciousness, Authority of. 1882. Prof. A. H. Newman, D.D.; Prof. E. H. Johnson, D.D.
- Christian Life, Meditative Element in. 1882. T. S. Barbour, D.D.; F. H. Kerfoot, D.D.; Pres. H. G. Weston, D.D.
- Christian Life, The, a Normal Life. 1905. Rev. A. K. DeBlois, LL.D.; Carter Helm Jones, D.D.
- Christian Principles, Are They a Hindrance to Financial Success? 1904. Rev. M. Ashby Jones; Mr. J. Spencer Dickerson; Rev. E. B. Pollard, Ph.D.
- Christian Science. 1888. W. E. Hatcher, D.D.; G. E. Horr, Jr., D.D.
- Christian Work, Shall Our Young People be Organized for? 1893. Henry C. Vedder, Esq.; J. B. Gambrell, LL.D.

- Christian Year, The. 1892. H. G. Weston, D.D.; Rev. W. H. P. Faunce, D.D.; R. S. MacArthur, D.D.
- Christianity and the Body. 1883. Pres. S. L. Caldwell, D.D.
- Christianity and War. 1896. Gen. T. J. Morgan, LL.D.; Hon. J. L. M. Curry, LL.D.; Hon. Morton B. Howell.
- Christianity and Heathen Religions. 1892. E. Braislin, D.D.; Prof. Nathaniel Schmidt; F. M. Ellis, D.D.
- Christianity and Worldliness. 1893. T. E. Brown, D.D.
- Christianity and Business. 1893. Prof. E. P. Gould.
- Christianity and Politics. 1883. A. S. Woodworth, Esq.
- Christianity, The Truths of, How Far Can They be Stated in Terms of Naturalism? 1898. Geo. B. Foster, D.D.; W. N. Clarke, D.D.; Albert Foster, D.D.; D. B. Purinton, LL.D.
- Church Architecture. 1883. Rev. C. J. Baldwin; J. R. Thomas, Esq.
- Church and Amusements. See Amusements.
- Church and the Children. 1882. John Humpstone, D.D.; A. J. Sage, D.D.; A. E. Waffle, D.D.
- Church, Country, Problems of. 1896. Rev. W. L. Munger; Rev. J. H. Boldridge.
- Church, Current Expenses of, and Benevolence. 1885. H. H. Lamport, Esq.
- Church, Duty of, in Improving the Condition of the Laboring Man. 1899. Rev. Geo. R. Robbins; Pres. Lee D. Lodge; Rev. Riley A. Vose; T. E. Brown, D.D.
- Church, What is the Duty of, Toward the Defective and Dependent Classes? See Defective and Dependent Classes.
- Church, Edification of. 1884. J. L. Burrows, D.D.
- Church Life, Tradition as a Formative Force in Baptist. See Tradition.
- Church and Money Power. 1893. W. H. P. Faunce, D.D.; Prof. Walter Rauschenbusch, D.D.
- Church Membership, Is Baptism Essential to? See Baptism.
- Church Nurture and Discipline. 1888. F. M. Ellis, D.D.
- Church, Organizations for Christian Work Other than the. 1889. L. A. Crandall, D.D.; Rev. Joshua Denovan; A. Blackburn, D.D.
- Church Polity, Does the N. T. Provide a Definite and Permanent? 1904. Rev. Everette Gill, Th.D.; Prof. Walter Rauschenbusch, D.D.; Lansing Burrows, D.D.; Pres. Emory Hunt, D.D.
- Church Property, Taxation of. 1882. Hon. G. H. Andrews.
- Church Property, Tenure of. 1885. Alfred Taylor, Esq.
- Church, Purity of the. W. W. Boyd, D.D.
- Church and State, Relation of. 1889. Rev. A. H. Munroe; D. E. Thompson, Esq.
- Church, Terms of Admission to. 1888. E. T. Hiscox, D.D.
- Church, Test of Admission to. 1885. Prof. T. H. Pattison, D.D.
- Church, Woman's Work in the. 1887. W. M. Lawrence, D.D.; J. W. Wilmarth, D.D.
- Church Work, Enlarged, in Cities. See Cities.
- Church Work, The Social Elements in. 1883. Z. Grenell, D.D.; J. B. Simmons, D.D.; W. E. Hatcher, D.D.

- Churches, the, What Should They Demand of the Theological Schools? 1904. See Theological Schools.
- Cities, Enlarged Church Work in. 1890. Albert G. Lawson, D.D.; Rev. R. H. Conwell; John Humpstone, D.D.
- Cities, Government of. 1890. Rev. Francis Bellamy; Hon. A. S. Bacon; Rev. Leighton Williams.
- Colleges, What Does the Denomination Owe to its; and What Do its Colleges Owe to the Denomination? 1894. Pres. B. L. Whitman, D.D.; Alvah S. Hobart, D.D.; Pres. E. Benjamin Andrews, D.D., LL.D.
- Common Schools versus Parochial. 1888. P. S. Moxom, D.D.
- Conceptions of Salvation, Ethical versus Forensic. 1893. Rev. C. S. Gardner; Rev. R. G. Boville; George E. Horr, Jr., D.D.
- Congress, Baptist, Historical Sketch of. 1883. Albert G. Lawson, D.D.
- Consolidation, The, of Our National Societies. 1901. L. A. Crandall, D.D.; J. F. Elder, D.D.; D. B. Jutten, D.D.
- Conversion, The Psychology of. 1897. Prof. Noah Davis, LL.D.; Nathaniel Butler, LL.D.; Pres. W. S. Ryland, D.D.; Pres. J. H. Harris, LL.D.
- Corporations, Semi-Public, Relation of State to Them and Their Employees. 1895. Hon. Thomas E. Barkworth; Prof. A. W. Small, LL.D.
- Cosmopolitanism vs. Patriotism. 1901. Rev. E. F. Merriam; Prof. B. Terry, Ph.D.; E. B. Andrews, LL.D.; H. C. Mabie, D.D.
- Country Church, Problems of the. 1896. W. L. Munger; Rev. J. H. Boldridge.
- Covetousness, The Sin of. 1887. Prof. J. M. Stiffler, D.D.; Prof. C. R. Henderson, D.D.; P. S. Henson, D.D.
- Creeds, Authoritative, Is there a Place for, in Religion? 1899. Rev. S. Z. Batten; H. M. Sanders, D.D.; Rev. Howard L. Jones; Rev. J. R. Brown.
- Criminal Classes, The Formation of; Its Causes and Its Cure. 1894. Prof. C. R. Henderson, D.D.; Rev. George H. Hickox; Mornay Williams, Esq.
- Cross, Power of the, in the Life of the Believer. 1897. J. T. Dickinson, D.D.; Donald D. McLaurin, D.D.
- Current Theologies. Are they Based on the Scriptures or on Philosophy? 1902. Spenser B. Meeser, D.D.; J. T. Beckley, D.D.; B. D. Hahn, D.D.
- Dangers of Militarism. 1896. Hon. J. L. M. Curry, LL.D.
- Defective and Dependent Classes, What is the Duty of the Church to the? 1905. Prof. C. R. Henderson, D.D.; Prof. R. S. Colwell, D.D.; Rev. S. Z. Batten.
- Denominational Beliefs and Religious Teachers. 1897. See Should Denominational Beliefs, etc.
- Denominational Loyalty, What Constitutes? 1899. J. T. Christian, D.D.; A. S. Hobart, D.D.; Rev. Emory W. Hunt; Prof. S. C. Mitchell.
- Disarmament of Nations. 1889. G. D. Boardman, D.D.; J. E. Wells, Esq.; Pres. J. G. Schurman, LL.D.
- Divorce, A National Law of. 1888. Hon. A. S. Bacon.
- Divorce Question in the Church. 1883. C. A. Owen, D.D.

Divorce Question in the State. 1883. H. S. Burrage, D.D.; Hon. James Buchanan.

Easter. See Christian Year.

Edification of the Church. 1885. J. L. Burrows, D.D.

Education. See Colleges.

Education, The English Bible in. 1884. Pres. J. A. Broadus, D.D., LL.D.

Education, Greek Philosophy in. 1884. Pres. E. B. Andrews, LL.D.

Education. Religious Instruction in the State. 1886. Prof. N. K. Davis; Prof. Galusha Anderson, D.D.

Education, State, Limits of. 1888. Prof. B. Puryear, LL.D.

Education, State, Progress of. 1888. Prof. Walter Rauschenbusch.

Education, Theological, Improvement in the Methods of. 1887. H. C. Mabie, D.D.; Prof. W. C. Wilkinson, D.D.

Education. See Common Schools.

Emotionalism in Religion. 1893. John L. Johnson, LL.D.; T. A. K. Gessler, D.D.

Employees of Semi-Public Corporations, Relation of the State to. 1895. Hon. T. E. Barkworth; Prof. A. W. Small, LL.D.

Ethical Bearing of Monism. 1895. Prof. G. B. Moore, D.D.

Ethical Value of Old Testament in Modern Life. See Old Testament.

Ethical versus Forensic Conceptions of Salvation. 1893. Rev. C. S. Gardner; Rev. R. G. Boville; George E. Horr, Jr., D.D.

Ethics, The, of Gambling. See Gambling.

Evangelism, Modern. 1882. A. J. Gordon, D.D.; P. S. Henson, D.D.

Evangelism, Modern, or Substitutes for the Old-Fashioned Revival. 1901. See Modern Evangelism.

Evolution, Man's Fall and Redemption in the Light of. 1898. A. H. Strong, LL.D.; George D. Boardman, LL.D.; H. H. Peabody, D.D.; L. C. Barnes, D.D.

Example, Christ as. See Christ.

Faith Cures. 1886. Prof. F. H. Kerfoot, D.D.; Pres. W. H. Whitsitt, D.D.

Fall of Man and Redemption in the Light of Evolution. See Evolution.

Father of All Men, Is God the? 1896. F. H. Rowley, D.D.; Rev. G. C. Baldwin, Jr.; Pres. W. Pope Yeaman, D.D.

Financial Success, Are Christian Principles a Hindrance To? See Christian Principles.

Forensic Conceptions of Salvation. See Ethical.

Function of Ordinances in Religion. See Ordinances.

Future Life, Conditional Immortality. 1886. Willard H. Robinson, D.D.

Future Life, Endless Punishment. 1886. Prof. E. B. Hulbert, D.D.

Future Life, Future Probation. 1886. Prof. E. H. Johnson, D.D.

Gambling, The Ethics of. 1901. Prof. S. C. Mitchell, Ph.D.; Rev. Harold Pattison; Rev. A. W. Wishart; Rev. Frank Dixon.

God, Is He the Father of All Men? 1896. F. H. Rowley, D.D.; Rev. G. C. Baldwin, Jr.; Pres. W. Pope Yeaman, D.D.

Government, Our, and the Oppressed of Other Nations. 1897. See Our Government.

Heathen Religions. See Christianity.

- Holy Spirit, Baptism of. 1895. Rev. F. L. Chapell; H. M. Sanders, D.D.
- How Far Has New Testament Precedent the Authority of Divine Command? 1896. Pres. J. P. Greene, LL.D.; Prof. H. H. Harris, LL.D.; T. D. Anderson, D.D.; Pres. W. T. Stott, D.D.
- Immanence, Divine, in Recent Theology. 1890. Pres. A. H. Strong, D.D.; P. S. Moxom, D.D.
- Immigration. 1888. D. C. Potter, D.D.; Hon. J. G. Sawyer.
- Immortality, Conditional. See Future Life.
- Immortality in the Light of Scientific Research. 1903. Prof. John F. Genung, Ph.D.; Pres. Chas. E. Taylor, LL.D.; Prof. E. E. Ayres; Pres. John H. Harris, LL.D.
- Improvement of Theological Instruction. 1899. O. P. Eaches, D.D.; Rob't MacDonald, D.D.; Rev. F. C. Woods; E. B. Pollard, Ph.D.
- Indian Question. 1885. H. L. Wayland, D.D.
- Indwelling Christ, The. 1893. Rev. Carter Helm Jones.
- Inerrancy of the Scriptures. 1892. Rev. T. A. T. Hanna; Prof. D. G. Lyon, Ph.D.; J. B. G. Pidge, D.D.; Prof. Howard Osgood, D.D.
- Inspiration of the Scriptures. 1886. O. P. Eaches, D.D.; Prof. G. D. B. Pepper, D.D.
- Intellectual Problems, The Spiritual Life as Affected by. 1885. A. A. Kendrick, D.D.
- International Arbitration. 1896. Hon. Morton B. Howell.
- International and Independent Systems of Sunday School Lessons. See Sunday Schools.
- Interpretation of the Old Testament. See Old Testament.
- Is God the Father of All Men? 1896. F. H. Rowley, D.D.; Rev. G. C. Baldwin, Jr.; Pres. W. Pope Yeaman, D.D.
- Is the Trust Beneficial or Injurious to Society? Rev. W. Quay Roselle, Ph.D.; Prof. Chas. W. Needham; Hon. H. R. Pollard; Frank Dickerson, Esq.
- Keswick Movement, The. 1901. E. E. Chivers, D.D.; Warren G. Partidge, D.D.
- Kingdom of God, What is the? 1894. Rev. Samuel Z. Batten; Prof. J. M. Stiffer, D.D.; Rev. Edwin M. Poteat.
- Labor Question. 1882. A. J. Fox, Esq.
- Labor Question. 1886. G. T. Dowling, D.D.; P. S. Moxom, D. D.; Hon. James Buchanan.
- Labor Question. See also Socialism, Land Question, Monopolies, Profit Sharing, Money Power.
- Laboring Man, Duty of the Church in Improving Condition of. 1899. Rev. Geo. R. Robbins; Pres. Lee D. Lodge; Rev. Riley A. Vose; T. Edwin Brown, D.D.
- Land Question, 1887. Hon. J. R. Doolittle; Hon. Allen Zollars.
- Liberator, Christ the. See Christ the Liberator; Christ the Unifier.
- Liturgy in Baptist Churches. 1885. E. Braislin, D.D.
- Lord's Supper, Is Baptism Prerequisite to? 1897. O. P. Gifford, D.D.; P. S. Henson, D.D.; R. H. Conwell, D.D.
- Loyalty, Denominational. See Denominational Loyalty.

- Militarism, Dangers of. 1896. Hon. J. L. M. Curry, LL.D.
- Ministry, The Coming. 1883. Pres. E. Dodge, D.D., LL.D.; J. C. Hiden, D.D.; P. S. Moxom, D.D.
- Missions, Self-Help in. 1884. Prof. Franklin Johnson, D.D.
- Missions. See Christianity and Heathen Religions.
- Missionary Effort, The Economics of. 1882. G. E. Merrill, D.D.; Pres. A. H. Strong, D.D.
- Missionary Endeavor in its Bearings on Social and Political Development. 1884. Prof. H. H. Harris, LL.D.
- Missionary Endeavor in its Contributions to Human Knowledge. 1884. W. S. McKenzie, D.D.
- Modern Evangelism. 1901. W. M. Lawrence, D.D.; Rev. J. H. Randall; D. Shepardson, Ph.D.; Rev. Clayton S. Cooper.
- Modern Scholarship, Interpretation of the Old Testament as Affected by. See Old Testament.
- Modern Thought, Skeptical Drifts in. 1882. Lemuel Moss, D.D.
- Mohammedan Propagandism. 1888. Rev. F. S. Dobbins.
- Money Power, The Church and. 1893. Rev. W. H. P. Faunce, D.D.; Prof. Walter Rauschenbusch.
- Monism. 1895. Prof. F. C. French, Ph.D.; Prof. A. Hovey, D.D., LL.D.; Prof. G. B. Moore, D.D.
- Monopolies, Natural and Artificial. 1889. Hon. David Mills, M.P.; Prof. Walter Rauschenbusch; Rev. Leighton Williams.
- Morality, Physiological Basis of. 1895. Prof. W. L. Poteat; Rev. S. B. Meeser; Smith Baker, M.D.
- Mormon Question. 1885. T. A. K. Gessler, D.D.
- Mosaic Code, The Sanitary Provisions of. 1883. G. H. Fox, M.D.
- Municipal Government. 1890. Rev. Francis Bellamy; Hon. A. S. Bacon; Rev. Leighton Williams.
- Music, Public Worship in Relation to. 1884. Robert Lowry, D.D.
- National Societies, Our, Consolidation of. 1901. L. A. Crandall, D.D.; J. F. Elder, D.D.; H. F. Colby, D.D.; D. B. Jutten, D.D.
- Nations, Our Government and Other. See Our Government, etc.
- Naturalism? How Far Can the Truths of Christianity be Stated in the Terms of. See Christianity.
- Negro, The Future of the Educated. 1902. Robert H. Pitt, D.D.; Geo. R. Hovey, D.D.; A. C. Dixon, D.D.; Chas. S. Morris, D.D.
- Negroes. See Race Problem of the South.
- Newspapers, Religious. 1887. H. L. Wayland, D.D.
- Newspapers, Secular. 1887. Robert J. Burdette, Esq.; G. W. Lasher, D.D.
- New Testament Books of, in the Light of Modern Research. 1895. Rev. B. D. Hahn; P. A. Nordell, D.D.; Prof. Milton G. Evans, D.D.
- New Testament, Does it Provide a Definite and Permanent Church Polity? See Church Polity.
- New Testament Precedent. How Far Has It the Authority of Divine Command? 1896. J. P. Greene, LL.D.; Prof. H. H. Harris, LL.D.; T. A. Anderson, D.D.; Pres. W. T. Stott, D.D.
- Normal Life, The Christian Life a. See Christian Life.



- Old Testament, The Interpretation of the, as Affected by Modern Scholarship. 1894. Prof. John R. Sampey, D.D.; Pres. W. R. Harper, Ph.D.; Prof. Charles Rufus Brown, D.D.; Prof. Howard Osgood, D.D., LL.D.
- Old Testament, The Ethical Value of, in Modern Life. 1905. Prof. W. R. Betteridge, Rev. Theo. G. Soares, Ph.D.; Prof. J. R. Sampey, D.D.; Rev. Rufus W. Weaver, Ph.D.
- Oneness in Christ. 1904. Rev. John F. Herget; J. N. Prestridge, D.D.
- Opportunity, The, for Baptists in Present Religious Progress. 1898. W. C. Bitting, D.D.; A. H. Newman, D.D.; Rev. Everett D. Burr.
- Ordinances in Religion, What is the Function of? 1905. Prof. W. O. Carver, D.D.; Pres. L. D. Osborne, Ph.D.; Rev. J. A. Herrick, Ph.D.; E. A. Hanley, D.D.
- Organizations for Christian Work. See Church.
- Organization of the Young People. See Young People.
- Our Government and the Oppressed of Other Nations. 1897. Prof. H. P. Judson, LL.D.; Hon. P. S. Grosscup; Prof. O. T. Mason, LL.D.; Geo. W. Northrop, Jr., M.A.
- Parochial Schools versus Common. 1888. P. S. Moxom, D.D.
- Pastor, The, as a Soul-Winner. 1896. P. T. Hale, D.D.; S. H. Greene, D.D.
- Paternalism in Government. See State Help.
- Penalty, The Function of, in the Christian Religion. 1901. B. L. Whitman, D.D., LL.D.; Rev. W. Warren Giles; Rev. R. A. Ashworth; J. B. Thomas, D.D.
- Patriotism versus Cosmopolitanism. See Cosmopolitanism.
- Penology. See Criminal Classes.
- Pentateuch. See Old Testament.
- Philosophy and Theological Thought as Influenced by Philosophical Methods. 1884. Prof. Heman Lincoln, D.D.
- Philosophy, Greek, in Education. 1884. Pres. E. B. Andrews, LL.D.
- Philosophical Basis of Monism. 1895. Prof. F. C. French, Ph.D.
- Physiological Basis of Morality. 1895. Prof. W. L. Poteat; Rev. S. B. Meeser; Smith Baker, M.D.
- Pleasure, The Present Worship of. J. O. B. Lowry, D.D.; A. G. Upham, D.D.
- Politics, Christianity in. 1883. A. S. Woodworth, Esq.
- Political Reform, The Pulpit in Relation to. 1892. H. H. Peabody, D.D.; C. R. Henderson, D.D.; Rev. Thomas Dixon, Jr.
- Polity, Baptist, Centralization in. 1895. J. T. Christian, D.D.; C. B. Crane, D.D.; D. W. Faunce, D.D.
- Power of the Cross in the Life of the Believer. 1897. J. T. Dickinson, D.D.; Donald D. MacLaurin, LL.D.
- Prayer Meeting? What Change, if any, is Demanded in the. 1903. Curtis Lee Laws, D.D.; Rev. Herbert E. Wise; Wayland Hoyt, D.D.; Rev. W. G. Fennell, D.D.
- Prayer, Place of, in Public Service. 1884. Rev. S. H. Greene, D.D.

- Precedent of the New Testament and Divine Command. 1896. Pres. J. P. Greene, LL.D.; Prof. H. H. Harris, LL.D.; T. D. Anderson, D.D.; Pres. W. T. Stott, D.D.
- Press, The Religious. 1887. H. L. Wayland, D.D.
- Press, The Secular. 1887. Robert J. Burdette, Esq.; G. W. Lasher, D.D.
- Priesthood of All Believers. 1899. Rev. C. H. Pendleton; Geo. E. Rees, D.D.
- Probation, Future. See Future Life.
- Problems of the Country Church. 1896. Rev. W. L. Munger; Rev. J. H. Boldridge.
- Problems of Statesmanship and the Pulpit. See Pulpit.
- Profit Sharing. 1887. Prof. W. Moncrief.
- Progress, Religious, Opportunity for Baptists in Present. See Opportunity.
- Prohibition. 1888. H. A. Delano, D.D.
- Prohibitory Legislation, Ethics and Expediency of. 1884. Prof. A. A. Hopkins.
- Prohibitory Legislation, as a Question of Method. 1884. J. W. Willmarth, D.D.
- Property, Taxation of Church. 1882. Hon. G. H. Andrews.
- Property, Tenure of Church. 1885. Alfred Taylor, Esq.
- Protestantism, Romanist Survivals in. See Romanist Survivals.
- Protestantism, What is the Source of Authority in? 1905. Prof. M. G. Evans, D.D.; Rev. J. L. Cheney, D.D.; Rev. H. P. Whidden; Prof. C. L. Williams.
- Psychology of Conversion, The. 1897. Prof. Noah Davis, LL.D.; Pres. Nath. Butler, LL.D.; Pres. W. S. Ryland, D.D.; Pres. J. H. Harris, LL.D.
- Pulpit and Reform. See Political Reform.
- Pulpit, The, and Problems of Statesmanship. 1902. H. H. Peabody, D.D.; Rev. Woodman Bradbury; Wm. A. Munroe, Esq.; C. Rogers Woodruff, Esq.
- Punishment, Future. See Future Life.
- Race Problem in the South. 1890. Prof. J. C. Long, D.D.; H. L. Wayland, D.D.; Rev. D. Wilshere.
- Race and Religion on the American Continent. 1882. J. M. Hoyt, LL.D.; Prof. E. G. Robinson, D.D., LL.D.
- Reason, Relative Authority of. 1892. Pres. D. J. Hill, LL.D.; Prof. W. N. Clarke, D.D.; Prof. E. G. Robinson, D.D., LL.D.; Prof. A. T. Robertson.
- Reconciliation, The, Wherein Lies the Efficacy of Jesus' Work in. See Wherein Lies, etc.
- Redemption and Fall in the Light of Evolution. See Evolution.
- Reform. See Temperance, Municipal Government, Socialism, Land Question, Labor Question, Political Reform.
- Relation of Baptist to Other Denominations. 1896. L. A. Crandall, D.D.; Rev. J. O. Rust; Norman Fox, D.D.
- Relation of the State to Semi-Public Corporations and Their Employees. 1895. Hon. T. E. Barkworth; Prof. A. W. Small, LL.D.

- Religion, The Relation of Theology to. See Theology.
- Religion, Emotionalism in. 1893. John L. Johnson, LL.D.; T. A. K. Gessler, D.D.
- Religion, Popular Indifference to. 1886. M. MacVicar, LL.D.; John Peddie, D.D.
- Religion and Race. See Race.
- Religious Instruction, Should it be Given in State Schools? 1905. Geo. W. Lasher, D.D.; T. C. Johnson, D.D.
- Religious Teachers? Should Denominational Beliefs Impose Limitations Upon. 1897. Pres. A. K. DeBlois, LL.D.; A. K. Parker, D.D.; Rev. R. T. Jones; Geo. A. Lofton, D.D.
- Resurrection of the Body, The. 1899. Prof. Jas. Ten Broeke, Ph.D.; Norman Fox, D.D.; Rev. Walter Calley; H. C. Applegarth, D.D.
- Revelation, Does it End with the Scriptures? Prof. Wm. A. Stevens, D.D.; Chas. H. Watson, D.D.; Rev. E. P. Farnham; Rev. Leighton Williams.
- Revised Version, its Practical Use. 1885. H. F. Colby, D.D.
- Revival, Old-Fashioned, Proper Substitutes for. 1901. W. M. Lawrence, D.D.; Rev. J. H. Randall; D. Shepardson, Ph.D.; Rev. Clayton S. Cooper.
- Ritschlian Theology, The. Its Meaning and Value. 1900. Prof. Gordon B. Moore, D.D.; Rev. W. B. Matteson; Rev. J. H. Haslam.
- Romanism, its Political Aspects. 1888. H. MacDonald, D.D.; Rev. H. B. Grose.
- Romanism, in Relation to Scientific Thought. 1888. A. J. Rowland, D.D.
- Romanist Survivals in Protestantism. 1900. Wm. H. Whitsitt, LL.D.; Rev. Frank M. Goodchild; Rev. Sparks M. Melton; Madison C. Peters, D.D.
- Roman Law, Value of, in Education. 1884. P. A. Nordell, D.D.
- Sabbath Legislation. 1889. Rev. A. P. McDiarmid.
- Sabbath Observance, Scriptural Grounds of. 1886. J. F. Elder, D.D.
- Sabbath, Relation of, to Spiritual Life. 1889. Rev. J. W. A. Stewart.
- Sabbath, Utility of. 1886. Reuben Jeffrey, D.D.
- Salvation Army and Church. 1889. Rev. A. Blackburn.
- Scripture and Reason, Relative Authority of. 1892. Pres. D. J. Hill, LL.D.; Prof. W. N. Clarke, D.D.; Prof. E. G. Robinson, LL.D.; Prof. A. T. Robertson.
- Scriptures? The, Does Revelation End With. See Revelation.
- Scripture. See Bible.
- Self-Help in Missions. Prof. Franklin Johnson, D.D.
- Should Denominational Beliefs Impose Limitations upon Religious Teachers? 1897. Pres. A. K. DeBlois, LL.D.; A. K. Parker, D.D.; Rev. R. T. Jones; Geo. A. Lofton, D.D.
- Skeptical Drifts in Modern Thought. 1882. Lemuel Moss, D.D.
- Socialism, False and True. 1885. Pres. D. J. Hill, LL.D.
- Social Conditions, Influence of, on Spiritual Life. 1885. Rev. B. A. Greene.
- Social Conditions, Influence of, on Theological Thought. 1884. Prof. W. N. Clarke, D.D.

- Social Elements in Christianity. 1883. Z. Grenell, D.D.
- Social Elements in Church Work. 1883. W. E. Hatcher, D.D.; J. B. Simmons, D.D.
- Social and Political Development of Peoples as Affected by Missionary Endeavor. 1884. Prof. H. H. Harris, LL.D.
- Social Reform, Pulpit and. 1892. H. H. Peabody, D.D.; C. R. Henderson, D.D.; Rev. Thomas Dixon, Jr.
- Soul-Winner, The Pastor as. 1896. P. T. Hale, D.D.; S. H. Greene, D.D.
- State Help versus Self Help, or Paternalism in Government. 1898. Prof. W. Rauschenbusch; Prof. Shailer Matthews, D.D.; Geo. W. Douglas.
- State, Relation of Church and. 1889. Rev. A. H. Monroe; D. E. Thompson, Esq.
- State, Relation of, to Semi-Public Corporations and Their Employees. 1895. Hon. Thos. E. Barkworth; Prof. Albion W. Small, LL.D.
- State Schools, Religious Instruction in. See Religious Instruction.
- Sunday School Lessons, International and Independent System of. 1890. Warren Randolph, D.D.; E. A. Woods, D.D.; Prof. S. Burnham, D.D.
- Sunday. See Sabbath.
- Taxation of Church Property. 1882. Hon. G. H. Andrews.
- Teachings of Christ and the Apostles, Relative Authority of. 1897. Prof. E. D. Burton, D.D.; Dean W. P. McKee; Prof. Rush Rhees; Prof. C. L. Williams.
- Temperance, High License. 1888. Wayland Hoyt, D.D.
- Temperance, Prohibition. 1888. H. A. Delano, D.D.
- Temperance, Prohibitory, Legislation. 1884. Prof. A. A. Hopkins; J. W. Wilmarth, D.D.
- Tenure of Church Property. 1885. Alfred Taylor, Esq.
- Theological Education, Improvements in the Methods of. 1887. H. C. Mabie, D.D.
- Theological Instruction, Improvement of. 1899. O. P. Eaches, D.D.; Rob't MacDonald, D.D.; Rev. F. C. Woods; Prof. E. B. Pollard, Ph.D.
- Theological Schools? What Should the Churches Demand of the. 1904. Prof. E. D. Burton, D.D.; Pres. E. Y. Mullins, LL.D.; O. P. Gifford, D.D.
- Theological Thought, Influenced by Social Conditions. 1884. Prof. W. N. Clarke, D.D.
- Theologies, Current, Are They Based on the Scriptures or on Philosophy? 1902. Spenser B. Meeser, D.D.; J. T. Beckley, D.D.; B. D. Hahn, D.D.
- Theology, Its Relation to Religion. 1904. Rev. Chas. H. Dodd; Prof. W. J. McGlothlin, Ph.D., D.D.; Rev. D. B. Cheney.
- Theology, The Relations of Monism to. 1895. Pres. A. Hovey, D.D.; LL.D.
- Theology of New Testament in Light of Modern Research. 1895. P. A. Nordell, D.D.; Prof. Milton G. Evans, D.D.
- Theology, Divine Immanence in Recent. 1890. Pres. A. H. Strong, D.D.; P. S. Moxom, D.D.
- Trades Unionism, Does it Imperil Liberty? 1903. Prof. W. H. Bawden, Ph.D.; Rev. Edw. Holyoke; Rev. John Snape; Rev. W. Q. Rosselle, Ph.D.

- Tradition as a Formative Force in Baptist Doctrine and Church Life. 1894.  
Rev. A. S. Carman; Lansing Burrow, D.D.; Rev. L. D. Temple.
- Trust, The, Is it Beneficial or Injurious to Society? 1900. Rev. W. Quay  
Rosselle, Ph.D.; Prof. Chas. W. Needham; Hon. H. R. Pollard; Frank  
Dickerson, Esq.
- Types of Theology in N. T. 1895. Prof. Milton G. Evans, D.D.; P. A.  
Nordell, D.D.
- Unifier, Christ the. See Christ the Liberator, Christ the Unifier.
- Union, Christian, Proposed Bases of. 1890. T. T. Eaton, D.D.; C. D. W.  
Bridgman, D.D.; Rev. E. T. Tomlinson, Ph.D.
- Union of the Believer with Christ. 1898. Rev. C. A. Barbour.
- Union, Organic, of Christendom. 1887. G. D. Boardman, D.D.; Norman  
Fox, D.D.; Prof. Justus Bulkley, D.D.
- Union, Practical, Working, How Can Baptists Secure it for Themselves?  
1903. Russell H. Conwell, D.D., LL.D.; J. A. Johnston, D.D.; Len G.  
Broughton, D.D.
- Union of Various Baptist Bodies, Feasibility of. 1892. B. B. Tyler, D.D.;  
A. H. Lewis, D.D.; Prof. J. A. Howe, D.D.; Prof. W. H. Whitsitt,  
D.D.
- Unity, Diversity of Opinion Within the Limits of Denominational. 1882.  
C. B. Crane, D.D.; Prof. W. C. Wilkinson, D.D.
- Valid Baptism, What Constitutes? 1893. J. Judson Taylor, D.D.; Rev.  
E. B. Pollard, Ph.D.; J. B. Moody, D.D.
- War and Christianity. 1896. Gen. T. J. Morgan, LL.D.; Hon. J. L. M.  
Curry, LL.D.; Hon. Morton B. Howell.
- War, Is it Ever Justifiable? 1896. Gen. T. J. Morgan, LL.D.
- Weak Points in the Baptist Position. 1900. Rev. E. T. Tomlinson, Ph.D.;  
B. F. Woodburn, D.D.; Albert G. Lawson, D.D.
- Wherein Lies the Efficacy of Jesus' Work in the Reconciliation? 1900.  
W. R. L. Smith, D.D.; Prof. W. L. Poteat, A.M.; Rev. J. E. Sagebeer,  
Ph.D.; J. J. Taylor, D.D.
- Woman's Work in the Church. 1887. W. M. Lawrence, D.D.; J. W.  
Willmarth, D.D.
- Worldliness, Christianity and. 1883. T. E. Brown, D.D.; H. M. King, D.D.
- Worldliness, Remedy for. 1883. A. C. Dixon, D.D.
- Worship, Public, with Respect to Music. 1884. Robert Lowry, D.D.
- Y. M. C. A. and the Church. 1889. L. A. Crandall, D.D.; A. Blackburn,  
D.D.
- Y. P. S. C. E. and the Church. 1889. L. A. Crandall, D.D.; A. Blackburn,  
D.D.
- Young People, Culture of, for Christian Service. 1903. Rev. C. D. Case,  
Ph.D.; Rev. W. A. Wallace; Rev. F. A. Smith.
- Young People—Shall Our Young People be Organized for Christian Work?  
1893. Prof. Henry C. Vedder, D.D.; J. B. Gambrell, LL.D.

# Personal Index

## OF THE APPOINTED WRITERS AND SPEAKERS.

---

- Anderson, Galusha, D.D. Religious Instruction in State Education. 1886.
- Anderson, Thos. D., D.D. How Far has New Testament Precedent the Authority of Divine Command? 1896.
- Andrews, E. B., D.D., LL.D. The Greek Philosophy in Education. 1884.  
What Does the Denomination Owe to its Colleges, and What Do its Colleges Owe to the Denomination? 1894. Cosmopolitanism versus Patriotism. 1901.
- Andrews, Hon. G. H. Taxation of Church Property. 1882.
- Applegarth, H. C., D.D. The Resurrection of the Body. 1899.
- Ashworth, Rev. R. A. The Function of Penalty in the Christian Religion. 1901.
- Ayres, Prof. E. E. Immortality in the Light of Scientific Research. 1903.
- Bacon, Hon. A. S. A National Divorce Law. 1888. Municipal Government. 1890.
- Baker, Smith, M.D. The Physiological Basis of Morality. 1895.
- Baldwin, Rev. C. J., D.D. Church Architecture. 1883. Christ the Liberator; Christ the Unifier. 1894.
- Baldwin, Rev. Geo. C., Jr. Is God the Father of All Men? 1896.
- Barbour, Rev. Clarence A. The Union of the Believer with Christ. 1898.
- Barbour, T. S., D.D. Meditative Element in Christian Life. 1882.
- Barkworth, Hon. Thos. E. Relation of the State to Semi-Public Corporations and their Employees. 1895.
- Barnes, L. C., D.D. Man's Fall and Redemption in the Light of Evolution. 1898.
- Batten, Rev. S. Z. What is the Kingdom of God? 1894. Is There a Place for Authoritative Creeds in Religion? 1899. What is the Duty of the Church Toward the Defective and Dependent Classes? 1905.
- Bawden, Prof. H. Heath, Ph.D. Does Trades Unionism Imperil Liberty? 1903.
- Beckley, J. T., D.D. Are Current Theologies Based on the Scriptures or on Philosophy? 1902.
- Bellamy, Rev. Francis. Municipal Government. 1890.
- Betteridge, Prof. W. R. What is the Ethical Value of the Old Testament in Modern Life? 1905.
- Bitting, W. C., D.D. The Opportunity for Baptists in Present Religious Progress. 1898.

- Blackburn, Rev. A. Organizations for Church Work Other than the Church. 1899.
- Boardman, G. D., D.D., LL.D. The Organic Union of Christendom. 1887. Disarmament of Nations. 1889. Man's Fall and Redemption in the Light of Evolution. 1898.
- Boldridge, Rev. J. H. The Problems of the Country Church. 1896.
- Bonsall, Rev. A. J. Is Baptism Essential to Church Membership? 1902.
- Boville, Rev. R. G. Ethical versus Forensic Conceptions of Salvation. 1893.
- Boyd, W. W., D.D. Purity of the Church—Nurture and Discipline. 1888.
- Bradbury, Rev. Woodman. The Pulpit and Problems of Statesmanship. 1902.
- Braislin, E., D.D. Liturgy in Baptist Churches. 1885. Christianity in Relation to Heathen Religion. 1892.
- Bridgman, C. D. W., D.D. Proposed Basis of Christian Union. 1890.
- Broadus, J. A., D.D., LL.D. The Value of the English Bible in Secular and Religious Education. 1884.
- Broughton, Len G., D.D. How Can Baptists Secure for Themselves a More Practical Working Union? 1903.
- Brown, Chas. Rufus, D.D. The Interpretation of the Old Testament as Affected by Modern Scholarship. 1894.
- Brown, T. E., D.D. Christianity and Worldliness. 1883. What is the Duty of the Church in Improving the Condition of the Laboring Man? 1899.
- Brown, Rev. J. R. Is There a Place for Authoritative Creeds in Religion? 1899.
- Buchanan, Hon. James. Divorce in the State. 1883. The Labor Question. 1886.
- Bulkley, Justus, D.D. The Organic Union of Christendom. 1887.
- Burdette, Robert J., Esq. The Secular Press. 1887.
- Burnham, S., D.D. The International and Independent Systems of Sunday-school Lessons. 1890.
- Burr, Rev. Everett D. The Opportunity for Baptists in Present Religious Progress. 1898.
- Burton, Prof. E. D., D.D. Are the Teachings of the Apostles of Equal Authority with Those of Christ? 1897. What Should the Churches Demand of the Theological Schools? 1904.
- Burrage, H. S., D.D. Divorce in the State. 1883.
- Burrows, Rev. J. L. Church Edification—Practical Methods. 1884. Does the New Testament Provide a Definite and Permanent Church Polity? 1904.
- Burrows, Lansing, D.D. Tradition as a Formative Force in Baptist Doctrine and Church Life. 1894.
- Busfield, T. E., D.D. Is Baptism Essential to Church Membership? 1902.
- Butler, Nathaniel, LL.D. The Psychology of Conversion. 1897.
- Caldwell, S. L., D.D. Christianity and the Body. 1883.
- Calley, Walter, D.D. The Resurrection of the Body. 1899.
- Carman, Rev. A. S. Tradition as a Formative Force in Baptist Doctrine and Church Life. 1894.

- Carver, Prof. W. O., D.D. What is the Function of Ordinances in Religion? 1905.
- Case, Rev. C. D., Ph.D. The Culture of Our Young People for Christian Service. 1903.
- Chapell, Rev. F. L. Baptism of the Holy Spirit. 1895.
- Cheney, Rev. D. B. The Relation of Theology to Religion. 1904.
- Cheney, J. L., D.D. What is the Source of Authority in Protestantism? 1905.
- Chivers, E. E., D.D. The Keswick Movement. 1901.
- Christian, J. T., D.D. Centralization in Baptist Polity. 1895. What Constitutes Denominational Loyalty? 1899.
- Clarke, W. N., D.D. Phases of Theological Thought as Influenced by Social Conditions. 1884. The Relative Authority of Scripture and Reason. 1892. How Far Can the Truths of Christianity be Stated in the Terms of Naturalism? 1898.
- Colby, H. F., D.D. The Revised Version of the Scriptures; Its Practical Use. 1895.
- Colwell, Prof. Richard S., D.D. What is the Duty of the Church to the Defective and Dependent Classes? 1905.
- Conant, T. J., D.D. Modern Bible Criticism; Its History and Methods; Its Results. 1883.
- Conwell, R. H., D.D., LL.D. Enlarged Church Work in Cities. 1890. Is Baptism a Prerequisite to the Lord's Supper? 1897. How Can Baptists Secure for Themselves a More Practical Working Union? 1903.
- Cooper, Rev. Clayton S. Modern Evangelism or Proper Substitutes for the Old-fashioned Revival. 1901.
- Crandall, L. A., D.D. Organizations for Church Work Other than the Church. 1889. The Relations of Baptists to Other Denominations. 1896. The Consolidation of Our National Societies. 1901.
- Crane, C. B., D.D. Diversity of Opinion Within the Limits of Denominational Unity. 1882. Centralization in Baptist Polity. 1895.
- Curry, Hon. J. L. M., LL.D. The Dangers of Militarism. 1896.
- Davis, Prof. N. K. Religious Instruction in State Education. 1886. The Psychology of Conversion. 1897.
- De Blois, A. K., LL.D. Should Denominational Beliefs Impose Limitations upon Religious Teachers? 1897. The Christian Life a Normal Life. 1905.
- Delano, H. A., D.D. Prohibition. 1888.
- Denman, Rev. D. T. How Far May One Depart from Accepted Standards and Remain a Baptist? 1904.
- Denovan, Rev. Joshua. Organizations for Church Work Other than the Church. 1889.
- Dickerson, Frank, Esq. Is the Trust Beneficial or Injurious to Society? 1900.
- Dickerson, J. Spencer, Mr. Are Christian Principles a Hindrance to Financial Success? 1904.
- Dickinson, J. T., D.D. The Power of the Cross in the Life of the Believer. 1897.



- Dixon, Rev. A. C. Remedy for Worldliness. 1883. The Future of the Educated Negro. 1902.
- Dixon, Rev. Frank. The Ethics of Gambling. 1901.
- Dixon, Rev. Thomas, Jr. The Pupil in Relation to Political and Social Reform. 1892.
- Dobbins, Rev. F. S. Mohammedan Propagandism. 1888.
- Dodd, Rev. Chas. H. The Relation of Theology to Religion. 1904.
- Dodge, E., D.D., LL.D. The Coming Ministry; Its Chief Function. 1883. Christian Art in Relation to Baptism. 1885.
- Doolittle, Hon. I. R. The Land Question. 1887.
- Douglas, Geo. William. State Help versus Self Help, or Paternalism in Government. 1898.
- Dowling, G. T., D.D. The Labor Question. 1886.
- Eaches, O. P., D.D. Inspiration of the Scriptures. 1886. The Improvement of Theological Instruction. 1899.
- Eager, Prof. Geo. B., D.D. How Far May One Depart from Accepted Standards and Remain a Baptist? 1904.
- Eaton, T. T., D.D. Right Use of the Bible in Public Worship. 1884. Proper Attitude of the Church Toward Amusements. 1887. Proposed Basis of Christian Union. 1890.
- Elder, J. F., D.D. Sabbath Observance; Its Scriptural Grounds. 1886. The Consolidation of our National Societies. 1901.
- Ellis, F. M., D.D. Purity of the Church; Nurture and Discipline. 1888. Christianity in Relation to Heathen Religions. 1892.
- Evans, Prof. Milton G., D.D. Types of Theology Found in New Testament. 1895. What is the Source of Authority in Protestantism? 1905.
- Farnham, Rev. E. P. Does Revelation End with the Scriptures? 1902.
- Faunce, D. W., D.D. Church Edification. 1884. Centralization in Baptist Polity. 1895.
- Faunce, W. H. P., D.D. The Christian Year; How Far is its Recognition Advisable? 1892. The Church and Money Power. 1893.
- Fennell, Rev. W. G. What Change, if any, is Demanded in the Prayer Meeting?
- Ferris, Rev. Geo. H. On What Grounds Should We Accept the Biblical Books as Our Belief? 1898. How Far May One Depart from Accepted Standards and Remain a Baptist? 1904.
- Foster, Albert, D.D. How Far Can the Truths of Christianity be Stated in Terms of Naturalism? 1898.
- Foster, Prof. Geo. B., D.D. How Far Can the Truths of Christianity be Stated in Terms of Naturalism? 1898.
- Fox, A. J., Esq. The Labor Question. 1882.
- Fox, G. H., M.D. The Sanitary Provisions of the Mosaic Code. 1883.
- Fox, Norman, D.D. The Organic Union of Christendom. 1887. The Relation of Baptists to Other Denominations. 1896. The Resurrection of the Body. 1899.
- French, Prof. F. C., Ph.D. Monism; its Philosophical Basis. 1895.
- Fuller, A. K., D.D. Christ as Example. 1902.
- Gambrell, J. B., LL.D. Shall Our Young People be Organized for Christian Work? 1893.

- Gardner, Rev. C. S. Ethical versus Forensic Conceptions of Salvation. 1893.
- Genung, Prof. John F., Ph.D. Immortality in the Light of Scientific Research. 1903.
- Gessler, T. A. K., D.D. The Mormon Question. 1885. Emotionalism in Religion. 1893.
- Gifford, O. P., D.D. Church Edification. 1884. Is Baptism a Prerequisite to the Lord's Supper? 1897. What Should the Churches Demand of the Theological Schools? 1904.
- Giles, Rev. W. Warren. The Function of Penalty in the Christian Religion. 1901.
- Gill, Rev. Everette, Th.D. Does the New Testament Provide a Definite and Permanent Church Polity? 1904.
- Goodchild, Rev. Frank M. Romanist Survivals in Protestantism. 1900.
- Gordon, A. J., D.D. Modern Evangelism. 1882.
- Gould, Prof. E. P. Christianity in Business. 1883.
- Grant, Rev. James. Is Baptism Essential to Church Membership? 1902.
- Greene, Rev. B. A. The Spiritual Life as Affected by Social Conditions. 1885.
- Greene, J. P., LL.D. How Far has New Testament Precedent the Authority of Divine Command? 1896.
- Greene, S. H., D.D. The Place of Prayer in Public Service. 1884. The Pastor as a Soul-winner. 1896.
- Gregory, J. M., LL.D. Charities. 1882.
- Grenell, Z., D.D. The Social Element in Christianity as Related to Church Work. 1883. Christ the Liberator; Christ the Unifier. 1894.
- Grose, Rev. H. B. Romanism; Its Political Aspects. 1888.
- Grosscup, Hon. P. S. Our Government and the Oppressed of Other Nations. 1897.
- Hahn, Rev. B. D. Canonicity of the Books of the New Testament. 1895. Are Current Theologies Based on the Scriptures or on Philosophy? 1902.
- Hale, P. T., D.D. The Pastor as a Soul-winner. 1896.
- Hanley, E. A., D.D. What is the Function of Ordinances in Religion? 1905.
- Hanna, Rev. T. A. T. The Inerrancy of the Scriptures. 1892.
- Harper, W. R., Ph.D. The Interpretation of the Old Testament as Affected by Modern Scholarship. 1894.
- Harris, H. H., LL.D. Missionary Endeavor in its Bearings on the Social and Political Development of Peoples. 1884. How Far has New Testament Precedent the Authority of Divine Command? 1896.
- Harris, J. H., LL.D. The Psychology of Conversion. 1897. Immortality in the Light of Scientific Research. 1903.
- Haslam, Rev. J. H. The Ritschlian Theology. 1900.
- Hatcher, W. E., D.D. The Social Element in Christianity—in Church Life—in Church Work. 1883. Christian Science. 1888.
- Henderson, C. R., D.D. Covetousness. 1887. The Pulpit in Relation to Political and Social Reform. 1892. The Formation of Criminal Classes; Its Cause and Its Cure. 1894. What is the Duty of the Church to the Defective and Dependent Classes? 1905.
- Henson, P. S., D.D. Modern Evangelism. 1882. Covetousness. 1887. Is Baptism a Prerequisite to the Lord's Supper? 1897.

- Herget, Rev. John F. Oneness in Christ. 1904.
- Herrick, Rev. J. A., Ph.D. What is the Function of Ordinances in Religion? 1905.
- Hickox, Rev. Geo. H. The Formation of Criminal Classes; Its Cause and Its Cure. 1894.
- Hidden, J. C., D.D. The Coming Ministry—Its Supply and Preparation. 1883.
- Hill, D. J., LL.D. Modern Biblical Criticism; Its History and Methods; Its Results. 1883. Socialism; False and True. 1885. The Relative Authority of Scripture and Reason. 1892.
- Hiscox, E. T., D.D. Purity of the Church—Terms of Admission. 1888.
- Hobart, A. S., D.D. What Does the Denomination Owe to its Colleges, and What Do Its Colleges Owe to the Denomination? 1894. What Constitutes Denominational Loyalty? 1899.
- Holyoke, Rev. Edw. Does Trade Unionism Imperil Liberty? 1903.
- Hopkins, Prof. A. A. The Ethics and Expediency of Prohibitory Legislation. 1884.
- Horr, G. E., Jr., D.D. Christian Science. 1888. Ethical versus Forensic Conceptions of Salvation. 1893.
- Hovey, Pres. A., LL.D. Monism; Its Relation to Theology. 1895.
- Hovey, Geo. R., D.D. The Future of the Educated Negro. 1902.
- Howe, J. A., D.D. Is a Union of Various Baptist Bodies Feasible? 1892.
- Howell, Hon. Morton B. International Arbitration. 1896.
- Hoyt, J. M., LL.D. Race and Religion on the American Continent. 1882.
- Hoyt, Wayland, D.D. High License. 1888. What Change, if any, is Demanded in the Prayer Meeting? 1903.
- Humpstone, John, D.D. Enlarged Church Work in Cities. 1890. The Church and the Children. 1882.
- Hunt, Rev. Emory. What Constitutes Denominational Loyalty. 1899. Does the New Testament Provide a Definite and Permanent Church Polity? 1904.
- Hurlbert, E. B., D.D. Christ's Doctrine of Endless Punishment. 1886.
- Jeffery, Reuben, D.D. The Utility of the Sabbath. 1886.
- Jackson, Rev. John L. How Far May One Depart from Accepted Standards and Remain a Baptist? 1904.
- Johnson, E. H., D.D. Future Probation. 1886. The Authority of Christian Consciousness. 1889.
- Johnson, Franklin, D.D. Self-Help in Missions. 1884.
- Johnson, John L., LL.D. Emotionalism in Religion. 1893.
- Johnson, T. C., D.D. Should Religious Instruction be Given in State Schools? 1905.
- Johnston, J. A., D.D. How Can Baptists Secure for Themselves a More Practical Working Union? 1903.
- Johnston, Rufus P., D.D. Is Baptism Essential to Church Membership? 1902.
- Jones, Rev. Carter Helm, D.D. The Indwelling Christ. 1893. The Christian Life a Normal Life. 1905.

- Jones, Rev. Howard L. Is There a Place for Authoritative Creeds in Religion? 1899.
- Jones, M. Ashby. What Should the Churches Demand of the Theological Schools? 1904.
- Jones, Rev. R. T. Should Denominational Beliefs Impose Limitations Upon Religious Teachers? 1897.
- Judson, H. P., LL.D. Our Government and the Oppressed of Other Nations. 1897.
- Jutten, David B., D.D. The Consolidation of Our National Societies. 1901.
- Kendrick, A. A., LL.D. The Spiritual Life as Affected by Intellectual Problems. 1885.
- Kerfoot, F. H., D.D. Meditative Element in Christian Life. 1882. Faith Cures. 1886.
- King, H. M., D.D. Worldliness. 1883.
- Lamport, H. H., Esq. Current Expenses and Benevolence. 1885.
- Lasher, G. W., D.D. The Secular Press. 1887. Should Religious Instruction be Given in State Schools? 1905.
- Lawrence, W. M., D.D. Woman's Work in the Church. 1887. Modern Evangelism or Proper Substitutes for the Old-Fashioned Revival. 1901.
- Laws, Curtis Lee, D.D. What Change, if any, is Demanded in the Prayer Meeting? 1903.
- Lawson, Albert G., D.D. Historical Sketch of the Congress. 1883. Enlarged Church Work in Cities. 1890. Weak Points in the Baptist Position. 1900.
- Lewis, A. H., D.D. Is a Union of Various Baptist Bodies Feasible? 1892.
- Lincoln, Prof. Heman, D.D. Phases of Theologic Thought as Influenced by Philosophic Methods. 1884.
- Lodge, Pres. Lee E. What is the Duty of the Church in Improving the Condition of the Laboring Man? 1899.
- Lofton, Geo. A., D.D. Should Denominational Beliefs Impose Limitations Upon Religious Teachers? 1897.
- Long, J. C., D.D. The Race Problem of the South. 1890.
- Lowry, J. O. B., D.D. The Present Worship of Pleasure. 1903.
- Lowry, Robert, D.D. The Conduct of Public Worship with Respect to Music. 1884.
- Lyon, D. G., Ph.D. The Result of Modern Biblical Criticism. 1883. Inerrancy of the Scriptures. 1892.
- Mabie, H. C., D.D. Is There a Divine Method in Theological Education? 1887. Cosmopolitanism versus Patriotism. 1901.
- MacArthur, R. S., D.D. The Christian Year; How Far is Its Recognition Advisable? 1892.
- MacDonald, H., D.D. Romanism; Its Political Aspects. 1888.
- MacDonald, Robert, D.D. The Improvement of Theological Instruction. 1899.
- MacLaurin, Donald D., D.D. The Power of the Cross in the Life of the Believer. 1897.
- MacVicar, M., LL.D. Popular Indifference to Religion. 1886.
- MacDiamid, Rev. A. P. Sabbath Legislation. 1889.

- Mason, Prof. O. T., LL.D. Our Government and the Oppressed of Other Nations. 1897.
- Matteson, Rev. W. B. The Ritschlian Theology. 1900.
- Matthews, Prof. Shailer, D.D. State Help versus Self-Help, or Paternalism in Government. 1898.
- McGlothlin, Prof. W. J., Ph.D., D.D. The Relation of Theology to Religion. 1904.
- McKee, Rev. W. P. Are the Teachings of the Apostles an Equal Authority with those of Christ? 1897.
- McKenzie, W. S., D.D. Missionary Endeavor in its Contributions to Human Knowledge. 1884.
- McWhidden, Rev. Howard P. What is the Source of Authority in Protestantism? 1905.
- Meuser, Rev. S. B. The Physiological Basis of Morality. 1895. Are Current Theologies Based on the Scriptures or on Philosophy? 1902.
- Melton, Rev. Sparks W. Romanist Survivals in Protestantism. 1900.
- Merriam, Rev. E. F. Cosmopolitanism versus Patriotism. 1901.
- Merrill, G. E., D.D. The Economics of Foreign Missionary Effort. 1882. On What Grounds Should We Accept the Biblical Books as Our Bible? 1898.
- Mills, Hon. David, M.P. Natural and Artificial Monopolies. 1889.
- Mitchell, Prof. S. C., Ph.D. What Constitutes Denominational Loyalty? 1899. The Ethics of Gambling. 1901.
- Moncrief, Prof. J. W. Profit Sharing. 1887.
- Moody, J. B., D.D. What Constitutes Valid Baptism? 1893.
- Moore, Prof. G. B. Monism, Its Ethical Bearing. 1895. The Ritschlian Theology. 1900.
- Morgan, Gen. T. J., LL.D. Is War Ever Justifiable? 1896.
- Morris, Chas. S., D.D. The Future of the Educated Negro. 1902.
- Moss, Lemuel, D.D. Sceptical Drifts in Modern Thought. 1882.
- Moxom, P. S., D.D. Supply of the Coming Ministry. 1883. The Labor Question. 1886. Common versus Parochial Schools. 1888. The Divine Immanence in Recent Theology. 1890.
- Mullins, Pres. E. Y., D.D., LL.D. What Should the Churches Demand of the Theological Schools? 1904.
- Munger, Rev. W. L. The Problem of the Country Church. 1896.
- Munro, Rev. A. H. The Relations of Church and State. 1889.
- Munroe, Wm. A., Esq. The Pulpit and Problems of Statesmanship. 1902.
- Needham, Prof. Chas. W. Is the Trust Beneficial or Injurious to Society? 1900.
- Newman, Prof. A. H. The Authority of Christian Consciousness. 1889. The Opportunity for Baptists in Present Religious Progress. 1898.
- Nordell, P. A., D.D. The Value of Roman Law in Secular and Religious Education. 1884. Types of Theology in the Books of the New Testament. 1895.
- Northrup, George W., Jr., M.A. Our Government and the Oppressed of Other Nations. 1897.

- Osborne, Loran D., Ph.D. What is the Function of Ordinances in Religion? 1905.
- Osgood, Howard, D.D., LL.D. Modern Biblical Criticism; Its History and Method. 1883. The Inerrancy of the Scriptures. 1892. The Interpretation of the Old Testament as Affected by Modern Scholarship. 1894.
- Owen, C. A., D.D. Divorce in the Church. 1883.
- Parker, A. K., D.D. Should Denominational Beliefs Impose Limitations Upon Religious Teachers? 1897.
- Partridge, Rev. Warren G. The Keswick Movement. 1901.
- Pattison, Rev. Harold. The Ethics of Gambling. 1901.
- Pattison, T. H., D.D. Tests of Admission to the Church. 1885.
- Peabody, H. H., D.D. The Pulpit in Relation to Political and Social Reform. 1892. Man's Fall and Redemption in the Light of Evolution. 1898. The Pulpit and Problems of Statesmanship. 1902.
- Peddie, John, D.D. Popular Indifference to Religion. 1886.
- Pendleton, Rev. C. H. The Priesthood of All Believers. 1899.
- Pepper, G. D. B., D.D. Inspiration of the Scriptures. 1886.
- Peters, Madison C., D.D. Romanist Survivals in Protestantism. 1900.
- Pidge, J. B. G., D.D. The Inerrancy of the Scriptures. 1892.
- Pitt, Robert H., D.D. The Future of the Educated Negro. 1902.
- Pollard, Rev. E. B., Ph.D. What Constitutes Valid Baptism? 1893. The Improvement of Theological Instruction. 1899. Are Christian Principles a Hindrance to Financial Success? 1904.
- Pollard, Hon. H. R. Is the Trust Beneficial or Injurious to Society? 1900.
- Poteat, Edwin M., D.D. What is the Kingdom of God? 1894.
- Poteat, Prof. W. L. The Physiological Basis of Morality. 1895. Wherein Lies the Efficacy of Jesus' Work in the Reconciliation? 1900.
- Potter, D. C., D.D. What to Do with the Foreigners. 1888.
- Prestridge, Rev. J. N., D.D. Oneness in Christ. 1904.
- Purinton, D. B., LL.D. How Far Can the Truths of Christianity be Stated in Terms of Naturalism? 1898.
- Puryear, B., LL.D. How Far Should the State Educate? 1888.
- Randall, Rev. John H. Modern Evangelism, or Proper Substitutes for the Old-Fashioned Revival. 1901.
- Randolph, Warren, D.D. The International and Independent Systems of Sunday-school Lessons. 1890.
- Rauschenbusch, Prof. Walter. Progress of State Education. 1888. Natural and Artificial Monopolies. 1889. The Church and Money Power. 1893. State Help versus Self-Help, or Paternalism in Government. 1898. Does the New Testament Provide a Definite and Permanent Church Polity? 1904.
- Rees, Geo. E., D.D. The Priesthood of All Believers. 1899.
- Rhees, Pres. Rush, LL.D. Are the Teachings of the Apostles of Equal Authority with Those of Christ? 1897. Christ as Example. 1902.
- Rhoades, W. C. P., D.D. Child Nurture in Baptist Polity. 1900.
- Robbins, Rev. George R. What is the Duty of the Church in Improving the Condition of the Laboring Man? 1899.

- Robertson, Prof. A. T. *The Relative Authority of Scripture and Reason.* 1892.
- Robinson, E. G., D.D., LL.D. *Race and Religion on the American Continent.* 1882. *The Relative Authority of Scripture and Reason.* 1892.
- Robinson, Willard H., D.D. *Conditional Immortality.* 1886.
- Rosselle, Rev. W. Quay, Ph.D. *Is the Trust Beneficial or Injurious to Society?* 1900. *Does Trades Unionism Imperil Liberty?* 1903.
- Rowland, A. J., D.D. *Romanism: Its Relation to Scientific Thought.* 1888.
- Rowley, Rev. F. H., D.D. *Is God the Father of All Men?* 1896.
- Rust, Rev. J. O. *The Relation of Baptists to Other Denominations.* 1896.
- Ryland, W. S., D.D. *The Psychology of Conversion.* 1897.
- Sage, A. J., D.D. *The Church and the Children.* 1882.
- Sagebeer, Rev. J. E., Ph.D. *Wherein Lies the Efficacy of Jesus' Work in the Reconciliation?* 1900.
- Sampey, J. R., D.D. *The Interpretation of the Old Testament as Affected by Modern Scholarship.* 1894. *What is the Ethical Value of the Old Testament in Modern Life?* 1905.
- Sanders, Henry M., D.D. *Baptism of the Holy Spirit.* 1895. *Is There a Place for Authoritative Creeds in Religion?* 1899.
- Sawyer, Hon. J. G. *Limits of Immigration.* 1888.
- Schmidt, Prof. Nathaniel. *Christianity in Relation to Heathen Religions.* 1892.
- Schurman, J. G., LL.D. *Disarmament of the Nations.* 1889.
- Shepardson, Rev. Daniel, Ph.D. *Modern Evangelism, or Proper Substitutes for the Old-Fashioned Revival.* 1901.
- Simmons, J. B., D.D. *The Social Element in Church Work.* 1883.
- Small, Prof. Albion W., Ph.D. *The Relation of the State to Semi-Public Corporations and Their Employees.* 1895.
- Smith, Prof. Chas. Lee, Ph.D. *What is the Duty of the Church to the Defective and Dependent Classes?* 1905.
- Smith, Rev. F. A. *The Culture of Our Young People for Christian Service.* 1903.
- Smith, J. A., D.D. *Modern Biblical Criticism: Its Practical Bearings.* 1833.
- Smith, W. R. L., D.D. *Wherein Lies the Efficacy of Jesus' Work in the Reconciliation?* 1900.
- Snape, Rev. John. *Does Trades Unionism Imperil Liberty?* 1903.
- Soares, Rev. Theo. G., Ph.D. *What is the Ethical Value of the Old Testament in Modern Life?* 1905.
- Stevens, Prof. Wm. A., D.D. *Does Revelation End with the Scriptures?* 1902.
- Stewart, Rev. J. W. A. *Sunday Observance: Its Relation to Spiritual Life.* 1889.
- Stiffler, J. A., D.D. *Covetousness.* 1887. *What is the Kingdom of God?* 1894.
- Stott, W. T., D.D. *How Far has New Testament Precedent the Authority of Divine Command?* 1896.

- Strong, A. H., D.D. The Economics of Foreign Missionary Effort. 1882.  
The Divine Immanence in Recent Theology. 1890. Man's Fall and Redemption in the Light of Evolution. 1898.
- Taylor, Alfred, Esq. Tenure of Church Property. 1885.
- Taylor, J. Judson, D.D. What Constitutes Valid Baptism? 1893. Wherein Lies the Efficacy of Jesus' Work in the Reconciliation? 1900.
- Taylor, Pres. Chase E., LL.D. Immortality in the Light of Scientific Research. 1903.
- Temple, Rev. L. D. Tradition as a Formative Force in Baptist<sup>e</sup> Doctrine and Church Life. 1894.
- Ten Broeke, Prof. Jas., Ph.D. The Resurrection of the Body. 1899.
- Terry, Prof. Benj., Ph.D. Cosmopolitanism vs. Patriotism. 1901.
- Thomas, Prof. P. B., D.D. The Function of Penalty in the Christian Religion. 1901.
- Thomas, J. R., Esq. Church Architecture. 1883.
- Thompson, D. E., Esq. The Relation of Church and State. 1889.
- Tomlinson, E. T., Ph.D. Proposed Basis of Christian Union. 1890. Weak Points in the Baptist Position. 1900.
- True, B. O., D.D. On What Grounds Should We Accept the Biblical Books as Our Bible? 1898.
- Tupper, Kerr B., D.D. Proper Attitude of the Church Toward Amusements. 1887.
- Tyler, B. B., D.D. Is a Union of Various Baptist Bodies Feasible? 1892.
- Upham, A. G., D.D. The Present Worship of Pleasure. 1903.
- Vedder, Henry C., D.D. Shall Our Young People be Organized for Christian Work? 1893.
- Vose, Rev. Riley A. What is the Duty of the Church in Improving the Condition of the Laboring Man? 1899.
- Waffle, A. E., D.D. The Church and the Children. 1882.
- Wallace, Rev. W. A. The Culture of Our Young People for Christian Service. 1903.
- Watson, Rev. C. H. Proper Attitude of the Church Toward Amusements. 1887. Does Revelation End with the Scriptures? 1902.
- Wayland, Francis, LL.D. Charities. 1882.
- Wayland, H. L., D.D. The Indian Question. 1885. The Religious Press. 1887. The Race Problem of the South. 1890.
- Weaver, Rev. Rufus W., Ph.D. What is the Ethical Value of the Old Testament in Modern Life? 1905.
- Wells, J. E., Esq. Disarmament of Nations. 1889.
- Weston, H. G., LL.D. Meditative Element in Christian Life. 1882. The Christian Year: How Far is Its Recognition Advisable? 1892.
- Whidden, Rev. H. P. What is the Source of Authority in Protestantism? 1905.
- Whitman, B. L., D.D. What Does the Denomination Owe to Its Colleges and What Do Its Colleges Owe to the Denomination? 1894. The Function of Penalty in the Christian Religion. 1901.
- Whitsitt, W. H., D.D. Faith Cure. 1886. Is a Union of Various Baptist Bodies Feasible? 1892. Romanist Survivals in Protestantism. 1900.



- Wilkinson, W. C., D.D. Diversity of Opinion Within the Limits of Denominational Unity. 1882. Improvements in the Methods of Theological Education. 1887.
- Williams, Prof. C. L. Are the Teachings of the Apostles of Equal Authority with Those of Christ? 1897. What is the Source of Authority in Protestantism? 1905.
- Williams, Rev. Leighton. Natural and Artificial Monopolies. 1889. Municipal Government. 1890. Does Revelation End with the Scriptures? 1902.\*
- Williams, Mornay, Esq. The Formation of Criminal Classes: Its Cause and Its Cure. 1894.
- Willmarth, J. W., D.D. Prohibitory Legislation as a Question of Method. 1884. Woman's Work in the Church. 1887.
- Wilshire, Rev. D. The Race Problem of the South. 1890.
- Wise, Rev. Herbert E. What Change, if any, is Demanded in the Prayer Meeting? 1903.
- Wishart, Rev. A. W. The Ethics of Gambling. 1901.
- Woodruff, Clinton R., Esq. The Pulpit and Problems of Statesmanship. 1902.
- Woods, E. A., D.D. Proper Attitude of the Church Toward Amusements. 1887. The International and Independent Systems of Sunday-school Lessons. 1890.
- Woods, Rev. F. C. The Improvement of Theological Instruction. 1899.
- Woodburn, B. F., D.D. Weak Points in the Baptist Position. 1900.
- Woodworth, A. S., Esq. Christianity in Politics. 1883.
- Yeaman, W. Pope, D.D. Is God the Father of All Men? 1896.
- Zollars, Hon. Allen. The Land Question. 1887.

**Number of Copies of Proceedings**  

---

**of Baptist Congress still on hand**  

---

Prior to 1890—None

1890	33 copies
1891	None
1892	None
1893	None
1894	None
1895	None
1896	None
1897	None
1898	None
1899	118 copies
1900	86 copies
1901	75 copies
1902	86 copies
1903	299 copies
1904	90 copies

**FIFTY CENTS EACH**

Order of the Treasurer

**WILLIAM B. MATTESON, D.D.**

RED BANK, N. J.

To whom all orders for Copies  
of the Proceedings should be sent.



3 2044 052 686 730

# NEW PUBLICATIONS

## PHYLLIS BURTON

By MRS. S. R. GRAHAM CLARK

12mo. Illustrated. Price, \$1.00 net; postpaid, \$1.14

A book dealing with life in a New England village. The center of it is the doctor's home, and the heroine is the daughter Phyllis. About her and her sister and cousin the other characters are made to revolve, and they act their parts well.

## WINNING HIS DEGREE

By EVERETT T. TOMLINSON

12mo. Illustrated. Price, \$1.00 net; postpaid, \$1.10

With this book Mr. Tomlinson concludes the "Winner Series." It deals with the advanced years in college, as "Winning His 'W'" does with those of the freshman and sophomore.

## THE APPOINTED WAY

By HOPE DARING

16mo. Illustrated. Price, \$1.00 net; postpaid, \$1.12

A graphic description of the characteristic influence and workings of the Seventh Day Advent Church. The characters are well drawn, and the literary quality of the book, in its evidence of wide reading and in its expression, is above the average.

## THE HIGHER CRITICISM CROSS-EXAMINED

By FRED. D. STOREY

16mo. Price, \$1.25 net; postpaid, \$1.35

The emphatic point in this book is on the value of evidence, and to discuss this Mr. Storey is peculiarly fitted, since for many years he has been connected with the Appellate Department of the Supreme Court of New York.

## FROM OUT THE FLAME

By WILLIAM R. BURRELL

Price, \$1.00 net; postpaid, \$1.13

A narrative of the times of Paul and Nero, that period of the Church's life which witnessed its growth and furnished the occasion of its testing. It is a well-written, highly entertaining, and, withal, truly instructive story.

## A CHURCH ON WHEELS

By CHARLES HERBERT RUST

16mo. Illustrated. Price, 60 cents net; postpaid, 67 cents

Mr. Rust was for ten years on the chapel car, "Good Tidings," employed as one of the Society's Missionaries, and in this book he tells of his experiences in a most interesting way.

## LIFE AND LIGHT

Thoughts from the Writings of GEORGE DANA BOARDMAN, D.D. With Memorabilia by Friends. 12mo. Price, \$1.00 net, postpaid

This work is made up of choice gleanings from the writings of Doctor Boardman, collected and edited by Mrs. Boardman.

**American Baptist Publication Society**  
**1420 Chestnut St., Philadelphia.**

Press of Andrew H. Kellogg Co., 409-415 Pearl St., New York.